

The Effects of Popular Meat, Poultry and Dairy Labels on Consumers' Perceptions of the Ethical
and Environmental Implications Proposed by Those Labels

An Honors Thesis (HONR 490)

by

Amy Anderson

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Joshua Gruver

Signed

**Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana**

July, 2015

Expected Date of Graduation

July, 2015

Thesis
LD
2489
.Z4
2015
.A53

Abstract

Consumers are bombarded by buzzwords like ‘natural’, ‘organic’ and ‘cage-free’ or ‘free-range’ that plaster food packages in every supermarket to signify the product’s superior quality. But, do they really mean anything? The relationship between certain manufacturer’s and business’s labeling strategies and consumer acceptance of the implied practices behind those labels was assessed via a survey generated in Qualtrics. The survey, which remained active for two weeks, was sent out via the Ball State University campus email system to students, faculty and staff as well as to willing participants of the Muncie Masterworks Chorale. Approximately 60% of participants understand the factors that contributed to the definitions of the following labels that pertain to beef, pork, poultry, dairy or egg products: ‘natural’, ‘organic’, ‘cage-free’, ‘free-range’, ‘grass-fed’, ‘Certified-Humane’ and ‘non-GMO’. However, price and expiration date were found to have a higher influence on their purchasing habits than what labels were on the meat, poultry, dairy or egg product. These results could help promote discussions and debates surrounding the daily “*What should I eat*” dilemma so that we can make more informed, ethical decisions when the time comes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Joshua Gruver for advising me throughout this project. His guidance throughout this endeavor helped me to create a piece of research that I am proud to have written. Without his suggestions and support, I know that this paper would not be nearly as complete or professional as it needed to be. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents i

List of Figuresii

List of Tablesiii

Introduction1

Literature Review3

Methods4

Results6

Discussion16

Conclusion19

References23

Appendix25

List of Figures

Figure 1: Manufacturer Responses to the Questionnaire Sent Asking About Labels.....16

List of Tables

Table 1: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Natural’* Label as it Applies to Meat Products using a Likert Scale.6

Table 2: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Organic’* Label as it Applies to Meat Products using a Likert Scale.7

Table 3: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Organic’* Label as it Applies to Egg Products using a Likert Scale.7

Table 4: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Free-Range’* Label as it Applies to Poultry Products using a Likert Scale.8

Table 5: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Free-Range’* Label as it Applies to Beef and Pork Products using a Likert Scale.9

Table 6: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Free-Range’* Label as it Applies to Egg Products using a Likert Scale.10

Table 7: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Certified Humane’* Label as it Applies to Beef, Pork, Poultry, Dairy and Egg Products using a Likert Scale.11

Table 8: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Cage-Free’* Label as it Applies to Egg Products using a Likert Scale.12

Table 9: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Non-GMO’* Label as it Applies to Beef, Pork, Poultry, Dairy and Egg Products using a Likert Scale...13

Table 10: Store Participants Frequently Shop at for Meat, Poultry, Dairy and/or Egg Products13

Table 11: Factors Influencing the Consumer’s Decision to Purchase a Specific Meat, Poultry, or Dairy Product.14

Table 12: Percentage of Participants Who Do or Don’t Purchase Meat, Poultry, Dairy, and/or Egg Products with Any of the Labels in Question.15

Table 13: Likeliness to Purchase the Types of Products that Have Any of the Labels in Question if the Consumer Had Access to Them.15

Introduction

According to the United States Census Bureau, there are currently over 320 million people residing in the United States and by the year 2050, that number is estimated to increase to approximately 458 million (United States Census, 2010; Ortman and Guarneri, 2009). An increasing population signifies implications for what and how we eat. The United States Department of Agriculture (2012) projects that in 2015; the average American will consume 204.4 lbs of red meat (veal, lamb/mutton, beef and pork) and poultry per year. If we continue to eat meat at this rate, much of our energy and resources, as a nation, will continue to be allocated to finding and implementing ways to sustainably provide food for our growing population. My research focuses on understanding trends regarding consumer perception of various meat, poultry, dairy and egg labels including 'natural', 'organic', 'cage-free', 'grass-fed', 'free-range', 'Certified Humane', and 'non-GMO' to identify if particular factors, such as nutritional benefits of the products, ethical treatment of the animals, and especially the idea that certain labels insinuated a more sustainable alternative to conventional agricultural practices, influence and justify their reasoning to purchase these specific types of products.

What these labels insinuate regarding more sustainable practices and ethical treatment of animals being superior to conventionally raised products was a major focus of this study, so let's make sure we understand how 'sustainability' is defined in regards to food production. There are three components that comprise the idea of sustainability -economic viability, environmental stewardship, and animal welfare-that can be broken down into various subcategories (Capper, 2013). Croney, et al., (2012) explain that each of these aspects must be taken into consideration when considering how ethical and sustainable our current farming practices are because they are not just based on scientific reasoning, but also on personal values and biases which can lead to varying interpretations of the same data. He explains that various groups will have different

focuses: the producers will think more of the health and production values of the animal while animal protection groups “tend to focus on behavioral outcomes” (Croney, et al., 2012, p. 1572-1573).

However, how do consumers perceive sustainability when it relates to their purchases at the supermarket and how are their purchases influenced by certain labels on these meat, poultry, and dairy products? Do they, as consumers, trust the labels at face value and the implications those labels employ? Are they aware that ‘deceptive advertising’ and ‘greenwashing’ are two techniques that companies can employ to sway consumer purchasing preferences either by “misleading a reasonable consumer” or “[falsely] portraying themselves as environmentally responsible” respectively (Shaw and Jacob, 2012, p. 137, 208). Furthermore, how do businesses and manufactures perceive sustainability and what is their focus when trying to sell their products to consumers? Reick, et al., (2008) explain that “the presence of product branding can have a major impact on a consumer’s purchasing decision” (p. 3593). Companies must understand this, or they wouldn’t spend over \$7 billion dollars a year on advertising food products (Gallo, 1997).

I hypothesize that there is a correlation between consumer perceptions of labels and consumer willingness to purchase those products based upon label implications. This research focused on understanding the connections between consumers’ perceptions of various labels on certain meat, dairy, egg and/or poultry products around Muncie and how, if at all, those perceptions of the labels on the products influence the purchase of that product. By creating and administering a survey to the Ball State community, I hope to gain a better understanding about consumer perceptions of some popular labels and use this information to create an educational pamphlet that could help inform consumers about what labels really mean and the potential ethical

implications (including the treatment of the animals and the ecological effects of the operations that were used to create the meat, poultry, dairy, or egg product) due to wrongful perceptions of said labels. Additionally, I will send a questionnaire to certain stores and manufacturers that are popular in Muncie asking the stores if labels play a role when deciding which manufacturers to partner with and ask the manufacturers what criteria they consider when designing labels for their products. The information I receive will help me personally understand their decisions and could be used in the pamphlet as well.

Literature Review

The literature base for consumer perceptions about various food labels and sustainability is growing rapidly as more researchers deem it an important area of focus; especially since more people are becoming concerned with where their food comes from and how it is produced. Notably though, Freedman and Jurafsky (2011) studied the use of advertising language on expensive and inexpensive bags of potato chips to compare the representation of the socioeconomic classes in contemporary America. This study helped verbalize the idea that advertisers are doing their job: marketing their product to the desired population. Now, while I take these findings with a grain of salt (...and vinegar) because they apply to a non-essential snack item, I do feel that they provide insight into what techniques advertisers use to sell their products. Additionally, Kardes, Posavac, and Cronley (2004) state that, “because products are rarely described completely, consumers often form inferences that go beyond the information given” (p. 230.) which further extenuates the question: what do people infer from the labels they see in the supermarket and how do those labels subsequently influence their purchasing habits? Tonsor and Shupp (2009) as well as Sackett, Shupp and Tonsor (2011), asked similar questions while examining consumer inferences and valuations of food products that made ‘sustainably

produced' claims. Furthermore, Tavernier, Hartley and Derr (2006) provided some preliminary evidence that producer and consumer interests may be converging when it comes to production practices and food labels.

Webber (2012) states that, yes, we as a country use a lot of energy in the agricultural sector of our society and we need to do some deep reworking of the systems in place so that energy is harnessed from the system and not wasted. He also believes that understanding and employing the most energy efficient ways to grow different foods as well as implementing certain techniques such as drip irrigation, no-till planting, converting agricultural waste into power, as well as different behaviors such as reducing food waste and changing dietary attitudes and choices could help improve our efficiency and lessen our demand for fossil fuels. Additionally, Calker et al. (2005) surveyed experts in various technical fields about how sustainable various production practices were in terms of social and ecological sustainability. They found that the importance of attributes depended on the specific area: economic, internal social, external social, or ecological sustainability, but that profitability and working conditions were among the most highly regarded attributes to the economic and internal social sustainability sectors. Rainbolt, Onozak, and McFadden (2012) also looked at factors that may influence consumers when buying organic, fair-trade, or locally grown food and found that "positive attitude...and other psychological predictors might influence how much a consumer is willing to pay" (394).

Methods

Design: An electronic voluntary survey inquiring about consumer perceptions of certain meat, poultry, and dairy labels was created using Qualtrics. The first section of the survey asked the participants questions regarding their thoughts and perceptions about the qualifications certain products must meet in order to have certain labels- natural, free-range, cage free, organic,

non GMO, and humanely raised- applied to them. The second section asked participants questions about their purchasing preferences and opinions. The final section asked participants to describe the implications certain labels portrayed to the participant.

I also designed a questionnaire for a specific set of popular manufacturers (Nestlé, Cargill, Perdue, Tyson, Prairie Farms Dairy Inc., and Dean's) to understand their company's logic and how their company comes up with labels for their meat, poultry, egg, and/or dairy products and provide insight as to how they justify their designs with the consumer and environment in mind. Lastly, I created a questionnaire for stores in the Muncie area (Marsh, Wal-Mart, Meijer, ALDI, and Lahody Meats) to help me understand their company's logic, why their company partners with certain manufacturers, if labels play any role at all in their decision to partner with someone and provide insight as to how their company justifies its decisions with the consumer and environment in mind. I chose these four stores because they are found in various locations around Muncie and because they are also close to Ball State University. The manufacturers were chosen based on their prevalence within the selected stores.

Procedure: The survey and all accompanying components (i.e. the recruitment email and consent forms) were approved by Ball State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The survey was sent to all of Ball State University faculty, students, and staff using the Ball State University Communication Center emailing system and also to the members of the Masterworks Chorale via their personal emails. The number of responses logged were monitored using the Qualtrics program and two weeks after being activated and sent out to the public, (5/27/15-6/10/15) if 30-50 responses had not been acquired, the survey was resent via campus email and the personal emails. All responses will be kept on my password protected computer for two years and then deleted.

The questionnaires to the stores and manufacturers were also approved by the IRB. I called the companies to request an email that I could use if an email was not provided on their website, sent the link to the questionnaire in the recruitment email and waited for a response. I was able to ascertain emails for 8 of the 11 companies, but only 1 manufacturer completed the questionnaire and the responses were so vague (Figure 1) that the overall results of this portion were completely inconclusive.

Results

After two weeks of activation, 153 people had completed my survey and the link to the survey via Qualtrics was deactivated so that the data could be analyzed.

Table 1: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Natural’* Label as it Applies to Meat Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
There is a minimal amount of processing done to the carcass.	8.7%	25%	23%	33%	9.9%	3.11	1.15	172	43%
The meat contains no artificial ingredients.	6.3%	13%	8.6%	44%	28%	3.74	1.19	174	72%
The meat must contain no preservatives.	8.6%	25%	16%	33%	18%	3.26	1.26	174	51%

*This definition of ‘natural’ was acquired from Natural, Grass-fed, and Organic Beef (Machen, 2010).

Using a 5 point Likert Scale, 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree, participants were asked to rate how much they agreed with the factors that contribute to the definition of ‘natural’ as it applies to meat products. Of the three parts of the definition, people agreed mostly with the fact that the meat cannot contain any artificial ingredients (mean=3.74, SD=1.19). However, the fact that only about half of the participants, 51%, agreed or strongly agreed that the meat must also not contain any preservatives (mean=3.26, SD=1.26).

Table 2: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Organic’* Label as it Applies to Meat Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
The meat must contain at least 95% organic ingredients.	2.8%	15%	10%	47%	25%	3.75	1.08	175	72%
The meat must have no added sulfites.	1.7%	15%	24%	36%	23%	3.64	1.05	176	59%
The meat may contain up to 5% non-organic ingredients.	8.1%	22%	24%	40%	7.0%	3.16	1.09	172	47%

*This definition of ‘organic’ was acquired from Natural, Grass-fed, and Organic Beef (Machen, 2010) and the USDA Meat and Poultry Labeling Terms: Organic (Oct, 2014).

Again, using a 5 Point Likert Scale where 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree, the participants ranked how strongly they agreed with the statements pertaining to the definition of the ‘organic’ label. Subjects most readily agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “the meat must contain at least 95% organic ingredients, but even with organic in the sentence, only 72% agreed or strongly agreed (mean=3.75, SD=1.08). Also, the most people (14) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the fact that there could be up to 5% non-organic ingredients in organic products.

Table 3: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Organic’* Label as it Applies to Egg Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
No specification as to whether the hens must be caged or not.	3.5%	17%	20%	49%	11%	3.47	1.01	173	60%
Given access to the outdoors; the amount, duration and quality of outdoor access has no definition.	4.0%	29%	25%	39%	2.3%	3.06	.97	173	41%
Fed an organic, vegetarian diet, meaning no vaccines, pesticides or herbicides.	2.3%	7.0%	10%	56%	25%	3.94	.92	172	81%
Beak-trimming is a permitted practice.	8.7%	19%	41%	26%	5.8%	3.02	1.02	172	32%
Forced molting through starvation is permitted.	17%	27%	34%	17%	4.1%	2.63	1.09	172	21%
The diet may not consist of any genetically modified crops.	6.4%	22%	14%	40%	18%	3.41	1.20	172	58%

*This definition of ‘organic’ was obtained from the Humane Society of the United States’ webpage Egg Carton Labels: A Brief Guide to Labels and Animal Welfare (2013).

Using a Likert Scale ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree, participants more readily accepted the parts of the definition of ‘organic’ as it pertains to eggs that do not directly mean harm is inflicted on the animal. Of the 172 participants that answered this question, 81% of them agreed or strongly agreed that the hens must be fed an organic, vegetarian diet (mean=3.94, SD=.92) while only 32% and 21% agreed or strongly agreed that beak-trimming or forced molting were allowable practices on ‘organic’ hens respectively (mean=3.02, SD=1.02 and mean=2.63, SD=1.09).

Table 4: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Free-Range’* Label as it Applies to Poultry Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
Hens are given access to the outdoors.	3.3%	5.5%	5.0%	50%	36%	4.10	.96	181	86%
No specification to the duration of time allowed outside.	4.0%	18%	19%	41%	18%	3.51	1.10	177	59%
The animals can receive antibiotics and/or hormones.	10%	28%	14%	40%	8.5%	3.08	1.19	177	49%
The animals do not have to be fed an organic diet.	11%	21%	18%	40%	10%	3.17	1.20	177	50%
Beak-trimming is a permitted practice.	13%	21%	32%	27%	6.8%	2.93	1.13	177	34%
The use of anesthetic or painkillers for procedures are not required.	9.0%	22%	36%	25%	8.4%	3.02	1.08	177	33%
Forced molting is permitted.	11%	25%	41%	19%	4.5%	2.80	1.02	177	24%
No specification regarding the amount of space the animals are given to roam.	2.8%	26%	15%	40%	17%	3.42	1.13	178	57%

*This definition of ‘free-range’ was obtained from the Humane Society of the United States’ webpage Egg Carton Labels: A Brief Guide to Labels and Animal Welfare (2013).

Again, the five point Likert Scale was employed, 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree, the participants were asked to rate how likely they thought each sentence was a part of the definition ‘free-range’ as it applies to poultry products. The participants were more likely to agree or strongly agree to the statement that ‘hens are given access to the outdoors’ (mean=4.10, SD=.96) as well the fact that no regulations as to the duration of time allowed outside (mean=3.51, SD=1.10) or amount of space they’re given when outside (mean= 3.42, SD= 1.13)

than to the parts of the definition of ‘free-range’ stating that beak-trimming (mean=2.93, SD=1.13) and forced molting (mean=2.80, SD=1.02) are permissible practices.

Table 5: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Free-Range’* Label as it Applies to Beef and Pork Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
Beef that is only fed forage (any edible plant material that is grazed or harvested for feeding, excluding grain).	5.6%	25%	13%	44%	12%	3.32	1.05	177	56%
The animals must have constant access to pasture during the growing season and are not fed in confinement for long periods, if ever.	3.4%	15%	7.3%	52%	23%	3.76	1.07	177	75%
The animals are allowed to be fed vitamins and/or supplements.	3.4%	13%	24%	49%	10%	3.49	.97	174	59%
The animals can be confined for amounts of time.	4.5%	23%	16%	49%	7.4%	3.32	1.05	176	56%
The animals can receive antibiotics if they become injured in any capacity.	1.1%	9.1%	16%	62%	12%	3.74	.83	175	73%
The use of anesthetic or painkillers for procedures is not required.	7.4%	18%	42%	26%	6.3%	3.06	1.00	175	32%

*This definition of ‘free-range’ was acquired from Natural, Grass-fed, and Organic Beef (Machen, 2010) and the United States Standard for Livestock and Meat Marketing Claims webpage (USDA, 2002).

Using a Likert Scale of 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree, the participants were asked how likely they thought each statement was a part of the ‘free-range’ label definition as it applies to pork and beef. Only 75% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the principle statement surrounding the ‘free-range’ label definition that “animals must be given constant access to pasture during the growing season” (mean=3.76, SD=1.07). There is no one particular outstanding piece of data, for every statement except the last one regarding not using of painkillers or antibiotics for procedures, most participants ‘Agreed’ with the statements followed by ‘Neither Agree or Disagree’ bringing the average mean of the definition to 3.45.

Table 6: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Free-Range’* Label as it Applies to Egg Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
The hens are given access to the outdoors.	0%	4.1%	3.0%	67%	26%	4.15	.66	172	93%
There is no specification to the duration of time allowed outside.	3.5%	19%	16%	51%	9.9%	3.44	1.02	171	61%
The animals can receive antibiotics and/or hormones.	5.3%	22%	24%	43%	5.9%	3.22	1.03	170	49%
The animals do not have to be fed an organic diet.	5.3%	19%	16%	52%	7.1%	3.36	1.04	170	59%
Beak-trimming is a permitted practice.	10%	20%	40%	26%	4.1%	2.95	1.01	169	30%
There is no specification regarding the amount of space the animals are given to roam.	4.1%	28%	12%	49%	7.1%	3.28	1.07	170	56%
Forced molting is a permitted practice.	12%	24%	38%	22%	3.5%	2.81	1.03	170	26%

*This definition ‘free-range’ was acquired from the Humane Society of the United States” webpage Egg Carton Labels: A Brief Guide to Labels and Animal Welfare (2013).

Using a 5 point Likert Scale, 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree, the participants rated how strongly they agreed to the components of the definition of the ‘free-range’ label as it applies to eggs. Ninety three percent (93%) agreed or strongly agreed that the hens are given access to the outdoors (mean=4.15, SD=.66). As with the other definitions though, very few either agreed or strongly agreed that beak-trimming and forced molting are permissible practices, 30% and 26% respectively. All of these factors together compose the definition of ‘free-range’ label as it pertains to egg products and the average means of most of the components along with the fact that more than 50% of participants agreed or strongly agreed to only 4 out of the 7 components could suggest that people do not understand what this label really means.

Table 7: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Certified Humane’* Label as it Applies to Beef, Pork, Poultry, Dairy and Egg Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
Beef cattle must be raised with continual access to the outdoors.	1.2%	12%	19%	48%	19%	3.72	.95	172	67%
Cattle can receive antibiotics for medicinal purposes, not to promote growth.	0%	5.8%	15%	67%	14%	3.89	.70	172	81%
Feed and water must be attainable without undue competition.	0%	2.3%	13%	63%	22%	4.03	.67	172	85%
Provisions must be made to keep indoor chickens active by enriching their environment in various ways.	1.2%	9.9%	26%	48%	15%	3.65	.89	172	63%
Reduced feeding/starvation to force molting in hens is prohibited.	3.5%	6.9%	22%	47%	21%	3.75	.98	172	68%
The layer hens must be able to perform natural habits such as nesting and dustbathing.	1.2%	6.4%	22%	50%	20%	3.82	.87	172	70%
Beak trimming is permitted.	11%	32%	40%	15%	2.4%	2.67	.94	170	17%
Cows and pigs must be able to turn around and lay down freely.	0.6%	4.1%	12%	55%	28%	4.06	.79	172	83%
Pigs must be given access to materials that encourage the natural habits of rooting, pawing and foraging.	1.7%	6.4%	21%	52%	19%	3.80	.88	172	71%
The layer hens are not confined in cages.	1.2%	15%	22%	44%	18%	3.64	.98	171	62%
Confinement is prohibited except for certain circumstances such as during procedures.	0%	15%	20%	47%	18%	3.68	.94	173	65%

*This definition ‘Certified Humane’ was acquired from the Humane Farm Animal Care’s Animal Care Standards manuals for beef cattle (2014), chickens (2009), egg laying hens (2014), dairy cows (2014) and pigs (2013). Only the standards that pertained to the objective of this study were included.

The 1 thru 5 Likert Scale was employed again, 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree, to ask participants to rank how much they agreed with the parts of the definition of the ‘Certified Humane’ label. Even though the majority of the respondents in each section agreed to the statements (except for beak trimming, mean=2.67, SD=.94), the bulk of the means are in the high 3 (Neither Agree or Disagree) range with only 2, in the low 4 (Agree) range: free movement

of cows/pigs, and free access to water/food with undue competition having means of 4.06 (SD=.79) and 4.03 (SD=.67) respectively. These average means suggest that a number of people are somewhat hesitant when it comes to fully understanding this label or are unfamiliar with this label.

Table 8: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Cage-Free’* Label as it Applies to Egg Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
The hens are not raised in cages, but rather in barns with perches and nest-boxes.	1.7%	11%	4.1%	65%	19%	3.87	.90	172	84%
The birds may be in close quarters with each other.	2.3%	16%	17%	59%	5.8%	3.51	.92	172	65%
The birds do not have to have access to the outdoors.	16%	36%	16%	29%	2.9%	2.67	1.14	173	32%
Beak-trimming is permitted.	10%	20%	39%	27%	3.5%	2.94	1.02	172	31%
Forced molting through starvation is allowed.	16%	28%	34%	20%	2.9%	2.67	1.06	172	23%

*This definition of ‘cage-free’ was obtained from Egg carton labels: A Brief Guide to Labels and Animal Welfare (2013).

Participants were asked to rank how much they agreed with each of the statements that, together, make up the definition of the ‘cage-free’ label as it applies to eggs on a 1-5 Likert Scale with 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly Agree. As with the other labels, the components that implied harm to the animal including beak-trimming (mean=2.94, SD=1.02) and forced molting (mean=2.67, SD=1.06) had lower means than statements that the majority of the sample size could deduce from the label itself: the fact that the hens aren’t raised in cages, but rather in barns with perches and nest boxes (men=3.87, SD=.90). Interestingly, the fact that only 32% agreed or strongly agreed to the fact that birds don’t have to have outdoor access (mean=2.67, SD=1.14) is surprising because 83.1% agreed that they were raised in barns.

Table 9: Percentage of Participants Who Agree with the Factors Contributing to the Definition of the ‘Non-GMO* Label as it Applies to Beef, Pork, Poultry, Dairy and Egg Products using a Likert Scale.

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n	%A+SA
The animal has been fed a diet that does not contain genetically modified (GM) food.	2.3%	5.7%	5.7%	50%	36%	4.12	.92	174	86%

*This definition for ‘non-GMO’ was obtained from the Non-GMO Project Verified Seal webpage (Non-GMOproject.org, 2015).

Participants were asked to rank how much they agreed with the factor that defines the ‘non-GMO’ label as it applies to beef, pork, poultry, dairy and egg products using a 1-5 Likert Scale, 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree. The majority of the participants (86%) agreed or strongly agreed with the definition, with only 8% of participants disagreeing or strongly disagreeing to the statement suggesting that, not only is this label more direct in regards to what qualifications are needed to be met in order to be labeled ‘non-GMO’ but also that more people understand or know the definition of this particular label.

Table 10: Store Participants Frequently Shop at for Meat, Poultry, Dairy and/or Egg Products

Store	Response	%
Marsh	102	58%
Meijer	94	54%
Other*	85	49%
Walmart	81	46%
Aldi	46	26%
Lahody Meats	23	13%

*The “Other” category contains multiple locations such as Kroger, Costco, Ruler Foods, Trader Joes, Downtown Farmstand; many also responded with ‘local farmer’s markets’ and ‘butchers’.

There is quite a spread of places that participants frequent when buying groceries; however, 58% of participants conveyed that Marsh was at least one of the places they shop at. Interestingly, one store really does not outcompete all the others, but two of the stores in question, Aldi and Lahody Meats are not as popular as the other establishments, only garnering 26% and 13% respectively. Kroger was mentioned in the ‘Other’ category 22 times and 34 participants said they shopped at either stores promoting local farmers or actual farmers markets/ local butchers. This could imply that the trend of consumers

understanding that they have the power to choose where they buy their food and support practices they deem acceptable with their food dollars.

Table 11: Factors Influencing the Consumer's Decision to Purchase a Specific Meat, Poultry, or Dairy Product.

Meat, Poultry, or Dairy Products	# of responses	%
Price	151	86%
Expiration date	132	75%
Whether or not the meat is "grass-fed", "organic", "free-range", "natural", or "Certified Humane"	67	38%
Marbling of the product	67	38%
Who produced or packaged the item	55	31%
Whether or not the product is GMO free	42	24%
Other	16	9%
Eggs		
Expiration date	115	71%
Price	111	68%
Whether or not the eggs come from chickens that are "cage-free", "organic", "free-range", "natural", or "Certified Humane"	69	42%
Who produced or packaged the item	43	26%
color of the egg	38	23%
Whether or not the product is GMO free	31	19%
Other	19	12%

The participants were asked to check all factors that influence their decision of which product to purchase. The results in Table 11 indicate that price is the most influential factor (86%) to consumers when they are purchasing meat, poultry, and dairy products and is the second most influential factor to consumers when purchasing eggs (68%) behind expiration date (71%). On average, only 40% of consumers said that whether or not the product had any of the labels in question was a factor in their decision to purchase a product. This indicates that while people may care somewhat about how their product is made or what is in it, really how much it costs and when it will go bad are considered most important.

Table 12: Percentage of Participants Who Do or Don't Purchase Meat, Poultry, Dairy, and/or Egg Products with Any of the Labels in Question

Do you currently Purchase:	yes	no
'grass-fed' labeled meats and poultry	37%	63%
'organic' labeled beef, pork, poultry or dairy products	40%	60%
'free-range' labeled beef, pork or poultry	38%	62%
'natural' labeled beef, pork, poultry or dairy products	45%	55%
'certified humane' labeled beef, pork, poultry, and dairy products	21%	79%
'cage-free' labeled eggs	35%	65%
'organic' labeled eggs	31%	69%
'free-range' labeled eggs	32%	68%
'natural' labeled eggs	20%	80%
'certified humane' labeled eggs	11%	89%
'non-GMO' labeled products	35%	65%

These results indicate that, on the whole, people do not buy products with any of the labels this research focused on. The mean of the %yes was 31.4 while the mean %no was 68.6%. The reasons for not purchasing these types of products were because they were unwilling to pay for them; they saw no difference in this type of product and one that was produced using conventional methods; they did not have access to them; and they were unable to afford them suggesting that people are currently more worried about other factors contributing to purchasing their meat, poultry, dairy and eggs than how it was raised or how the practices affect the environment which can be found in the Appendix, Tables 1-11.

Table 13: Likelihood to Purchase the Types of Products that Have Any of the Labels in Question if the Consumer Had Access to Them

	# of responses	%
Yes	81	60%
No	54	40%

Of the reasons given pertaining to why consumers didn't buy meats, poultry, dairy or eggs with any of the labels in question on them, (they were unwilling to pay for them; they saw no difference in this

type of product and one that was produced using conventional methods; they did not have access to them; and they were unable to afford) 60% of participants said that they would buy these products if they were made available to them. This could suggest a demand for them at local stores for reasons such as the perceived nutritional, ethical, and/or environmental benefits of these types of products.

Figure 1: Manufacturer Responses to the Questionnaire Sent Asking About Labels

Q1: What percent of the annual budget is dedicated to advertisement, label advancement, management, enhancement, etc...?
A1: This question is too broad to give qualified answer.
Q2: How do you come up with the labels for the product? What is your company's process for doing this?
A2: Assuming you mean strategic design here. We consider the brand platform, the product, and the actual package configuration and imprint space available for branding and mandatory information.
Q3: Does your company have a set of guidelines that must be followed when creating a label? If so, could you please elucidate?
A3: Only Brand Standards of Identity and meeting regulatory requirements.
Q4: What do you intend to illustrate to the viewer when coming up with the label for your meat, poultry, and/or dairy products?
A4: This depends entirely on the specific product, the retail category and consumer perceptions.

This figure shows the questions and respective answers I received from a manufacturer; I reached out to six manufacturers, but only one responded vaguely and the information I gained was not very useful to my overall research.

Discussion

My goal was to try and determine if there was a correlation between consumer perceptions of certain labels and their willingness to purchase those products based upon label implications. However, my research stated that while consumers seem to hesitantly agree with parts of the definitions of these labels (Tables 1-9), they are not very likely to purchase these products (Table 12) currently.

As can be seen in tables 1-9, there is no strong pull one way or the other regarding people's ideas of what labels really mean. This supports Kardes, Posavac, and Cronley (2004) results which suggest that because products aren't described completely, consumers form their own inferences

about those products that may or may not be completely accurate. Yes, participants tended to agree with the parts of the various definitions that meant the animals were allowed more freedoms than their conventionally raised counterparts, but on average, when asked to rank how much they agreed with the following statements that defined the label, the means were in the 3 range (Neither Agree or Disagree). The fact that the means are largely in the 3 range (Neither Agree or Disagree), or even 2 (Disagree) in some circumstances relating to processes that inflict pain upon the animal, is enlightening, but also alarming. Tonsor and Shupp (2009) also concluded that “the typical U.S. consumer is not willing to pay a positive premium for beef, tomatoes, or apple products” (p. 378) with labels indicating that sustainable growing practices were implemented. They go on to say that “demand for beef, tomatoes and apples labeled as “sustainably produced” may...require target marketing to select sub-samples [of consumers]” (p. 380) and that the demand for these types of products is higher among people who associate “sustainable production with production practices including organic and environmentally friendly, as well as farm size and use of hired labor or pastoral methods” (p. 380). Consumers should know the qualifications that the labels they are looking for must adhere to so that it is possible to accurately purchase products coming from places that employ methods the consumer supports.

I also asked participants about what amount of influence, if any, specific labels had on their opinions of the “ethical implications” certain local, popular labels provoked. Responses varied depending on the label. For instance, many of the responses to the Horizon Organic Milk label and California Milk label (Appendix, Tables 12 and 13 respectively) suggested that the label did not persuade the consumer to buy the milk based solely on the label; saying that “the label alone would not drive [my] purchase” or that “there weren’t any implications...but the cow does look

happy”. The same types of responses were obtained when participants were asked about the Ekrich label and the Hillshire Farm label (Appendix, Tables 14 and 15 respectively). However, when asked about what the Perdue label implies to people (Appendix, Table 17), there were more respondents that said the label erected a façade of a ‘family-owned’ or a more ‘traditional’ farm scenario, but that they would not choose this type of poultry over another based solely on their label. The one label that more participants generally thought implied a more positive life for the animals involved was the Eggland’s Best, Cage Free Eggs label only “because it says, point blank ‘cage free’” (Appendix, Table 16). Overall though, the responses were pretty cynical, suggesting that the labels alone do not greatly influence these consumers’ decisions when at the grocery store.

Although some useful data about the perceptions of various labels was obtained from this survey, optimally I would change some things if I were to do this over again. Most notably, I would rewrite the survey to make sure that all statements were expressed in a clear concise manner, use different types of scales to measure their responses more clearly and refine it to include only questions that were pertinent to the focus of my research. By taking these steps, I feel like the results would be easier for everyone to interpret and possibly use themselves.

I would have also been interested in making the survey available to more people around the city of Muncie because the main pool of subjects were affiliated somehow, either student, faculty, or staff, with Ball State University and while their perceptions are very interesting in their own right, not all of them live in Muncie permanently, but rather only live here during the school year. By amending the survey to only allow people that permanently live in the region I was most interested in to take the survey, my results would have been more applicable and specific to Muncie.

Extenuations upon this research could also help broaden the understanding of why people are choosing certain meat, poultry, and/or dairy products over others and help us as researchers identify any trends in perceptions of meat, poultry and/or dairy based on labeling. This information could then be used to figure out how perceptions/opinions about certain labels have changed in the recent past and what that implies for the companies/manufacturers of these food products along with the environmental impacts associated with a shift from large scale industrial farming to a smaller method, or vice versa.

Another interesting angle to adopt would be to take a more in depth look and thoroughly explore what advertising means the companies are actively creating, distributing and airing to spread their brand and products. Then, one could cross the messages conveyed to the consumers about their environmental and ethical awareness in the advertisements to their actual practices to see how similar the implications in the various forms of advertisements are to the laws and practices the companies actually perform and endorse.

Conclusion

One of the most significant findings my research presented was that, no matter how ‘label illiterate’ we as a consumer body are, we can still understand the price-tag, because it affects us all. Price seems to be one of, if not the most, important factor to 86% of people surveyed about deciding which beef, pork, poultry or dairy product to choose and 68% of people surveyed about choosing between which eggs to purchase followed by or following expiration date and *then* having any of the various labels coming in third, percentage-wise (Table 11). This isn’t shocking considering the unemployment rate in Muncie is .10% higher than the national average of 6.30%, household income and family median income are both roughly \$20,000 below the national

average, and the percentages of households with an income of less than \$15,000 (24.12%) or with an income between \$15,000-\$20,000 (9.15%) are nearly double those nationally, 12.61% and 5.33% respectively (Economy, 2015). Also taking into account that in 2013, 23.1% of Muncie citizens were living below the poverty level (Poverty Rates, 2015), it isn't hard to understand why price is such an integral, deciding factor for local residents, local college students that don't have a lot (if any) extra spending money, or anyone that has to live on a regimented budget in Muncie.

When asked why they did not purchase these types of products, the majority of the participants responded with "neither agree or disagree" (Appendix, Tables 1-11). Furthermore, the results showed that, for every label, price was the biggest factor as to why they did not purchase these types of products (Appendix, Tables 1-11). This could suggest a level of consumer hesitation to purchase these more expensive, labeled products. It could also indicate that, maybe, participants are unaware of the differences between the types of products or disinclined to care about learning those differences. Interestingly though, that idea contrasts with the data from Table 12. Would 60% of respondents actually purchase different types of meat, pork, poultry, dairy or eggs if they were made available, realistically? Or, would they keep purchasing the conventionally made, cheap alternatives that enforce conventional practices which harm the environment and the animals?

Additionally, for some labels (e.g. "organic", "Free-Range", "natural" and "Certified Humane"; Appendix, Tables 7, 8, 9, 10 and 5 respectively) the percentages of participants who agreed or strongly agreed that they 'did not see a difference in nutritional value between the labeled product and the conventionally raised product' and were either unwilling or unable to purchase these products were all high. This could suggest a correlation between a lack of understanding

the labels and the differences they entail with respect to conventionally raised products and consumers' willingness to purchase these items.

Naivety on the national scale concerning what is going on behind closed [barn] doors is a large factor, in my opinion, as to why it has taken so long for us to start taking an interest in what we are eating and where it actually came from. Transparency is something that we as consumers should demand from companies, especially companies in control of how certain foods are produced. The fact that my research suggests that people do not understand what the labels on certain products mean and imply is a direct result of our nation's stance to agricultural transparency. On June 10th, 2015, for example, the US House of Representatives repealed a bill that would make country of origin labels, including where the animal was born, raised and slaughtered, mandatory on meat products from Canada, the United States of America and Mexico due to the fact that Mexico and Canada feel that "U.S. meatpackers don't want to go through the hassle and expense of tracking imported animals. As a result, meatpackers offer lower prices for hogs and cattle from Canada and Mexico" (Tracy, 2015). By knowing where the animals come from though, consumers could get a better understanding of how the animals were raised given their location, what kinds of practices are common in regards to raising food animals in those areas and the company's views on the environment along with what procedures they follow in order to conserve our planet as best they can while still providing food for consumption.

Understanding what labels you decide to put in your cart matter because every purchase is another vote for change or complacency within our nation's food system. It is our duty as consumers to be informed about what kinds of products we purchase and where we purchase them from, and these finding suggest we still have a long way to go, but hopefully they provide a

starting point for more research in the future. Furthermore, it is also the duty of our government to promote more ethical and environmentally sustainable practices within today's agricultural enterprise *as well as* scrupulously enforce them so that when we see labels on these products, we know exactly what we are endorsing when we scan it at the check-out counter.

References:

- Calker, K.J., P.B.M. Berentsen, G.W.J. Giesen, and R.B.M. Huirne. 2005. Identifying and ranking attributes that determine sustainability in Dutch dairy farming. *Agriculture and Human Values* 22(1): 53-63.
- Capper, J.L. (2013). Should we reject animal source foods to save the planet? A review of the sustainability of global livestock production. *South African Journal of Animal Science*(43), 3, 233-247.
- Croney, C.C., Apley, M., Capper, J.L., Mench, J.A., and Priest, S. (2012). Bioethics symposium: The ethical food movement: What does it mean for the role of science and scientists in current debates about animal agriculture? *Journal of Animal Science* (90)5, 1570-1583. doi: 10.2527/jas.2011-4702.
- Economy in Muncie, IN. (2015) Retrieved from: <http://www.bestplaces.net/economy/city/indiana/muncie>
- Egg carton labels: A brief guide to labels and animal welfare. (2013). Retrieved from: http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/confinement_farm/facts/guide_egg_labels.html#.UqfTaeelH0s
- Freeman, J. and Jurafsky, D. 2011. Authenticity in America: Class distinctions in potato chip advertising. *Gastronomica: The Journal of Food and Culture*(11)4: 56-64.
- Gallo, A.E. (1997). Food advertising in the United States. Retrieved from: http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/91050/aib750i_1_.pdf
- Humane Farm Animal Care. (2014). *Animal care standard manual: Beef cattle*. Herndon, VA: Humane Farm Animal Care.
- Humane Farm Animal Care. (2009). *Animal care standard manual: Chickens*. Herndon, VA: Humane Farm Animal Care.
- Humane Farm Animal Care. (2014). *Animal care standard manual: Dairy cows*. Herndon, VA: Humane Farm Animal Care.
- Humane Farm Animal Care. (2014). *Animal care standard manual: Egg laying hens*. Herndon, VA: Humane Farm Animal Care.
- Humane Farm Animal Care. (2013). *Animal care standard manual: Pigs*. Herndon, VA: Humane Farm Animal Care.
- Kardes, F.R., S.S. Posavac, and M.L. Cronley. 2004. Consumer inference: A review of processes, bases, and judgment contexts. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 14(3): 230- 256.
- Non-GMOproject.org. (2015). *The “non-GMO project verified” seal*. Retrieved from <http://www.nongmoproject.org/learn-more/understanding-our-seal/>
- Ortman, J.M., and Guarneri, C.E. (2009). U.S. population projections:2000-2050. Retrieved from: <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/files/analytical-document09.pdf>

- Poverty rates in Muncie. (2015). Retrieved from: <http://www.city-data.com/poverty/poverty-Muncie-Indiana.html>
- Rainbolt, G, Onozak, Y, and McFadden, D. T. 2012. Consumer motivations and buying behavior: The case of the local food system movement. *Journal of Food Products Marketing* (18)5: 385-396.
- Reicks, A.L., Brooks, J.C., Kelly, J.M., KUEcker, W.G., Boillot, K., Irion, R., and Miller, M.F. (2008). National meat case study 2004: Product labeling information, branding, and packaging trends. *Journal of Animal Science*(86)12 , 593-3599. doi: 10.2527/jas.2007-0680.
- Sackett, H., Shupp, R., and Tonsor, G. (2011). Consumer perceptions of sustainable farming practices: A best-worst scenario. Proceedings from the *Agricultural and Applied Economics Association's 2011 AAEA and NAREA Joint Annual Meeting*. Pittsburgh, PA.
- Shaw and Jacob. (Eds.). (2012). SAGE brief guide to marketing ethics. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tavernier, E. M., Hartley, M. P., and Derr, D. A. 2006. Examining the relationship between production practices and food labels: The role of farm size. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*. 2006 (28)4:125-138.
- Tracy, T. (2015, June 10). House votes to remove country-of-origin labels on meats sold in the U.S. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/house-votes-to-remove-country-of-origin-labels-on-meat-sold-in-u-s-1433990294>
- Tonsor, G. and Shupp, R. (2009). Valuations of 'sustainably produced' labels on beef, tomato, and apple products. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* (38)3: 371–383.
- United States Census Bureau. (2010). Population clock. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/>
- United States Department of Agriculture. (Oct 2014). Meat and poultry labeling terms: Organic. Retrieved from: <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/ams.fetchTemplateData.do?template=TemplateA&navID=NationalOrganicProgram&leftNav=NationalOrganicProgram&page=NOPUnderstandingOrganicLabeling&description=Understanding%20Organic%20Labeling&acct=nopgeninfo>
- United States Department of Agriculture. (2012). Per capita consumption of poultry and livestock, 1965 to estimated 2015, in pounds. Retrieved from: <http://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/about-the-industry/statistics/per-capita-consumption-of-poultry-and-livestock-1965-to-estimated-2012-in-pounds/>
- United States Department of Agriculture. (Dec, 2002). United states standards for livestock and meat marketing claims. *Federal Registrar*, 67(205). pg 79554.
- Webber, M. E. 2012. More food, less energy. *Scientific American*, (306)1: 74-79.

Appendix: Survey Questions 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, and Textual Responses to Questions 35-40

Table 1: Q12: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Beef, Pork, or Poultry Products Labeled “Grass-Fed” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional value of the grass fed products and the conventionally raised ones.	12%	27%	39%	19%	4.3%	2.77	1.03	161
I am not willing to pay extra for these types of meats.	13%	20%	25%	33%	8.8%	3.04	1.19	159
I am not able to pay extra for these types of meats.	11%	20%	28%	32%	8.8%	3.07	1.15	159
I do not have access to these types of meats.	13%	23%	37%	25%	1.9%	2.78	1.02	158

Using a Likert Scale of 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree, the participants were asked how much they agreed with the reasons to not purchase beef, pork or poultry products labeled “Grass-Fed”. Forty-two percent (42%) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they did not buy “Grass-Fed” products because they simply didn’t want to pay extra (mean=3.04, SD=1.19), but 41% agreed or strongly agreed that they couldn’t afford these products (mean=3.07, SD=1.15). This may suggest that, if the prices of “Grass-Fed” products were lowered, more people would purchase them; however, some people may still not be convinced to purchase this type of product based upon price alone.

Table 2: Q14: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Beef, Pork, or Poultry Products Labeled “Free-Range” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional values of the free-range product and the conventionally raised ones.	8.3%	24%	42%	22%	3.8%	7.90	.97	156
I am not willing to purchase this type of product.	9.7%	36%	32%	16%	6.5%	7.73	1.05	154
These products are too expensive.	7.7%	19%	30%	34%	9.7%	8.19	1.09	155
I do not have access to free-range meat and eggs.	12%	41%	26%	19%	0.6%	7.55	.96	155

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 6 and the maximum value at 10 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

Again, by using a Likert Scale of 6=Strongly Disagree to 10=Strongly Agree*, I tried to assess what factors influenced the participants to not purchase beef, pork and/or poultry products labeled “Free-Range”. Forty-four percent (44%) of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they did not buy “Grass-Fed” products because they were too expensive (mean=8.19, SD=1.19), and an additional 23% said they were unwilling to pay the extra for these types of products

(mean=7.73, SD= 1.05). Again, this suggests that price is a very influential factor in what people are willing to purchase and, in order to change which products are preferred, prices will likely have to be changed.

Table 3: Q16: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Products labeled “Organic” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional value of the organic products and the conventionally raised ones.	13%	31%	29%	22%	5.1%	5.76	1.09	156
I am not willing to pay extra for this product.	11%	26%	21%	35%	7.7%	6.02	1.17	156
I cannot afford to pay extra for this type of product.	12%	24%	28%	28%	8.2%	5.96	1.16	158
I do not have access to this type of product.	18%	40%	22%	19%	1.3%	5.46	1.03	156

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 4 and the maximum value at 8 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

Using a Likert Scale of 4=Strongly Disagree to 8=Strongly Agree*, the participants were asked how much they agreed with the reasons to not purchase products labeled “Organic”. Again, price was the most common factor: 43% of participants were unwilling to pay (mean=6.02, SD=1.17) and roughly 36% agreed or strongly agreed that they could not afford “organic” products (mean=5.96, SD=1.16). Interestingly, though, approximately 28% of participants do not recognize a difference between the “organic” labeled products and conventionally raised ones (mean=5.76, SD=1.09) which could affect how much they are willing to pay for these products.

Table 4: Q18: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Meat, Pork, Poultry or Dairy Products labeled “Natural” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional values of the natural product and the conventionally raised ones.	9.0%	20%	42%	24%	5.1%	7.96	1.00	156
I am not willing to pay extra for natural labeled products.	7.7%	25%	33%	26%	8.3%	8.03	1.08	156
I am unable to afford these products.	10%	30%	36%	19%	3.9%	7.76	1.01	155
I do not have access to natural labeled products.	12%	32%	39%	16%	0.6%	7.61	.92	155

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 6 and the maximum value at 10 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

Again, the Likert Scale of 6=Strongly Disagree to 10=Strongly Agree*, was employed to try and understand what factors influence participants to not purchase products labeled “natural”. Much like the “organic” results, 29% of participants do not see a difference between “natural” labeled products and conventionally raised ones (Mean=7.96, SD=1) which could help explain why 34% of participants are unwilling to purchase these products (mean=8.03, SD=1.08). However, there was not a big pull to one side or the other-which can be seen in Table 4-and most participants ‘neither agreed or disagreed’ with these reasons as to why they don’t purchase “organic” meat, poultry, pork or dairy products.

Table 5: Q 20: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Meat, Pork, Poultry, or Dairy Products labeled “Certified Humane” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional values of the "Certified Humane" product and the conventionally raised ones.	6.4%	20%	46%	24%	3.2%	7.98	.91	156
I am not willing to pay extra for this type of product.	9.0%	29%	36%	21%	5.1%	7.85	1.02	156
I cannot afford these products.	10%	8.9%	39%	33%	3.8%	7.82	1.00	157
I do not have access to this type of product.	9.0%	21%	29%	31%	10%	8.12	1.13	156

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 6 and the maximum value at 10 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

The participants were asked how much they agreed with the reasons to not purchase meat, dairy, pork, or poultry products labeled “Certified Humane” using a Likert Scale of 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree*. These results suggest that while 41% agreed or strongly agreed that they did not have access to this type of product (mean=8.12, SD=1.13) there are still many participants (27%) who don’t recognize a difference between these products and conventionally raised ones (mean=7.98, SD=.91), which could be troubling.

Table 6: Q 23: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Egg Products labeled “Grass-Fed” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional value of the grass fed products and the conventionally raised ones.	8.8%	22%	42%	24%	2.7%	2.90	.96	148
I am not willing to pay extra for these types of eggs.	8.3%	26%	30%	29%	6.9%	3.00	1.08	145
I am not able to pay extra for these types of eggs.	8.2%	28%	35%	25%	4.1%	2.88	1.01	146
I do not have access to these types of eggs.	10%	30%	31%	23%	5.6%	2.83	1.07	144
I get my eggs from another source (i.e. neighbor's farm, friend's farm, my farm).	21%	29%	26%	19%	6.9%	2.63	1.19	147

Using a Likert Scale of 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree, the participants were asked how much they agreed with the reasons to not purchase egg products labeled “Grass-Fed”. Again, price was a big factor: 36% were unwilling to pay the extra for these eggs (mean=3, SD=1.08) and 29% agreed or strongly agreed that they were unable to pay for them (mean=2.88, SD=1.01). However, an additional 26% said they got their eggs from another source (mean=2.63, SD= 1.19).

Table 7: Q25: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Egg Products labeled “Organic” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional value of the organic products and the conventionally raised ones.	9.8%	25%	36%	25%	3.5%	5.87	1.01	143
I am not willing to pay extra for these eggs.	9.3%	22%	28%	32%	7.9%	6.07	1.11	139
I cannot afford to pay extra for these eggs.	11%	29%	35%	18%	6.3%	5.80	1.07	142
I do not have access to these types of eggs.	13%	35%	35%	15%	2.1%	5.59	.97	140
I get my eggs from another source (i.e. neighbor's farm, friend's farm, my farm).	20%	26%	30%	19%	4.9%	5.62	1.15	142

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 4 and the maximum value at 8 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

Participants were also asked how much they agreed with the reasons to not purchase egg products labeled “organic” using a Likert Scale of 4=Strongly Disagree to 8=Strongly Agree*. Again, the results show that the price matters because 40% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they were unwilling to pay extra for these types of eggs (mean=6.07, SD=1.11).

Table 8: Q27: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Egg Products labeled “Free-Range” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional values of the free-range product and the conventionally raised ones.	9.3%	20%	41%	25%	4.3%	7.95	1.00	140
I am not willing to purchase these types of eggs.	10%	30%	33%	20%	10%	7.85	1.09	138
I am unable to afford these types of eggs.	12%	29%	32%	22%	5.8%	7.81	1.08	139
I do not have access to these types of eggs.	13%	32%	35%	19%	2.2%	7.65	1.00	139

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 6 and the maximum value at 10 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

The Likert Scale of 6=Strongly Disagree to 10=Strongly Agree* was employed again to try and understand what factors influence participants who do not purchase egg products labeled “Free-Range” the most. The fact that the means are all clustered pretty tightly around 7.65-7.95, which signifies the ‘neither agree or disagree’ option suggests that, maybe participants are unaware of the differences between the types of products or disinclined to care about learning those differences.

Table 9: Q29: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Egg Products labeled “Natural” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional values of the natural product and the conventionally raised ones.	7.7%	20%	41%	25%	5.6%	8.01	1.00	143
I am not willing to pay extra for natural eggs.	8.5%	26%	31%	28%	6.3%	7.97	1.07	141
These products are too expensive.	8.5%	21%	34%	30%	7.1%	8.06	1.06	141
I do not have access to natural eggs.	12%	28%	40%	19%	1.4%	7.72	.95	141

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 6 and the maximum value at 10 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

Using the Likert Scale of 6=Strongly Disagree to 10=Strongly Agree*, participants were asked how much they agreed with the reasons to not purchase egg products labeled “natural”. Naturally, price proved to be a large reason. Roughly 34% of participants said they would be unwilling to pay for “natural” eggs (7.97, SD= 1.07) and 37% said they were too expensive (mean=8.06, SD= 1.06). This continues to suggest that people may hesitate to pay extra for certain labeled products.

Table 10: Q 30: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Egg Products labeled “Certified Humane” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional values of the "Certified Humane" product and the conventionally raised ones.	7.8%	21%	44%	23%	4.3%	7.96	.96	141
I am not willing to pay extra for this type of egg.	9.3%	26%	35%	24%	5.7%	7.91	1.05	141
I am unable to pay extra for these types of eggs.	11%	29%	36%	19%	4.3%	7.76	1.03	141
I do not have access to this type of egg.	9.0%	22%	31%	28%	9.7%	8.08	1.12	145

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 6 and the maximum value at 10 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

The Likert Scale of 6=Strongly Disagree to 10=Strongly Agree* was also employed to assess what factors influence people to not buy egg products labeled “Certified Humane”. Once more, the results show that most participants ‘neither agreed or disagreed’ with the reasons provided, but that price was still considered when comparing them to other types of eggs: 30% are unwilling to buy them (mean=7.91, SD=1.05) and 23% are unable to buy them (mean=7.76, SD=1.03).

Table 11: Q33: Percentage of Participants who Do Not Purchase Products labeled “Non-GMO” For Various Reasons

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean*	StDev	n
I see no difference in the nutritional values of the Non-GMO product and the conventionally raised ones.	9.4%	24%	38%	24%	4.7%	7.91	1.02	127
I am unwilling to pay extra for this type of product.	11%	24%	29%	27%	8.7%	7.98	1.14	127
I am unable to afford these products.	11%	27%	36%	18%	8.0%	7.84	1.10	125
I do not have access to these types of products.	12%	27%	35%	22%	3.1%	7.77	1.03	129

*For some reason, Qualtrics set the minimum value at 6 and the maximum value at 10 instead of 1 and 5 respectively when calculating the statistics and I was unable to change those values. This needs to be taken into consideration when referencing the mean values.

The Likert Scale of 6=Strongly Disagree to 10=Strongly Agree* was used to assess what factors influence people to not buy egg products labeled “Non-GMO”. Again, the results suggest that participants are unwilling to pay for these eggs (36%, mean=7.98, SD=1.14) and that they mostly do not have a preference one way or the other, judging by the high percentage of ‘neither agree or disagree’ responses (means 7.77-7.91).

Table 12: Textual Responses to the Question: "Does the Horizon label seem to suggest or imply any particular message regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well-being? Would you purchase this product over another product due to the label?"

The label implies a happy cow and a concern for the planet, though it's my understanding that the label "organic" has little to do in practice with the humane treatment of animals or concern for the environmental sustainability of milk production. The label doesn't say anything about either one of those things, so I find the "organic" label virtually meaningless to my decision-making about dairy products. I am unlikely to purchase an animal product from a large corporation, in part because their actual practices are not disclosed on their packaging.
I would purchase and have done so. It appears to be a label that indicates their quest to have organic livestock farming take place throughout the world.
Your questionnaire is far too loing and not well constructed.
Looks like a happy cow; don't buy this brand because it's too \$\$\$.
Aside from the blatant use of the word organic, they show a happy cow, seeming to suggest that their cattle are 'happy' and treated humanely. That being said, the label itself doesn't appeal to me very much so it wouldn't be a huge purchasing influence.
No
No, I don't know exasctly what it means and I am cynical about whether it means anything.
The label implies to me that the animals they have are treated more humanely even though the packaging only says that it is organic. I wouldn't buy something like this because of the label and I think the label is actually misleading.
Seems like they are conveying happy, well treated cows. The label probably wouldn't make be buy the product just on that basis alone.
You get the message that the cows are happy and therefore treated nicely
The cow looks happy, implying good animal treatment and well-being of the animals. The organic label implies that their cows are fed healthier. I would buy this product over another one due to the label if the prices were comparable.
Looks happy and able to exercise
The label might suggest that the company's thoughts on animal treatment are positive (humane, grass-fed, etc.) but there's no indication that this is true. I only say that because of the appearance of the cow on the label. If this is a milk label, the organic just refers to the milk rather than the treatment of the cow. I wouldn't purchase this product over another due to the label just because it says the word organic. I want to know what organic means in this case.
Because it says "organic", I assume the products they sell come from organically fed animals. Whether or not I would purchase the product depends on the price.
If the price wasn't much higher than a similar product and it was something I planned to provide to my grandchildren, I might buy it because of the word "organic"
It would appear to imply that they use organic ingredients and/or feed their cattle organic food.
This label seems to suggest that organic is good for the planet and that the cows are taken good care of. A happy looking cow jumping over the earth, that says all positive things to me. The cow seems to be happy that the milk is organic; he is waving the "organic" flag. If I could afford to buy organic milk, I would. Just that the package says "organic" and it is a brand that I recognize is enough reason for me to select this milk. The imagery does not entice me more than that.
It makes it look like the cows are happy and well taken care of.
I have purchased this product but not due to the label.
If it cost the same and fit my dietary restrictions, I would buy it because it does indicate happy animals and thoughtfulness about the environment.
No. It simply says that meat is organic. What else can meat be--plastic? I would want to know what they mean by organic. As shown in your example label, it tells me nothing, and seems to believe that that "organic" label would attract me as if I believed they fed it no artificial supplements, no antibiotics for

growth, and maybe that it is free range.
The label seems that they want the animals to be treated well. I would not buy this over another product due to the label because I don't judge my purchases purely on how the logo or packaging is designed.
The cow is happy and the earth indicates they are environmentally aware. No, it is fun but it doesn't really impact me in any other way.
No
No, I don't think this label brings to mind or displays any certain ideas regarding the company's views on how animals should be treated. The label would not make me more likely to buy this product.
No - the label does not seem to imply any particular message other than the product is "Organic". The label would not persuade me.
Campy, trendy message that means nothing to me...doesn't make me want to buy unless less expensive
It doesn't address treatment or well being. No.
It gives the appearance of a happy cow. To me Horizon 2% tastes the same as any other 2% so I go with the cheaper cost, I do not pay attention to if it was organic or how the cows were raised.
They seem to treat animals with kindness
Yes, I currently purchase milk for my toddler from this company. I believe the company is advocating safe treatment of animals based on the cow's expression on the label.
The label suggests it is better for the environment. No, I would not purchase this just because of the label.
That somehow it's fun for a cow to be torn away from its mother so we can drink disgusting milk. Would not purchase I don't drink milk.
The cows are free to roam and live happy lives. No, I would not purchase any products from this, or any other company that uses animals as a product.
I purchase this product occasionally. To me it says nothing about animal treatment but instead that there is less chemicals/preservatives in the milk.
The label gives no thought as to how the company would treat their animals. Also I believe it would not constitute in my decision on the product that I would be purchasing.
It implies that their animals are happy cows in real farms. But I will not purchase them anyway because I do not believe that this is true
Implies positive animal treatment. Would not purchase on the basis of the label alone.
That they treat animals well. They have the happy cow.
Suggests a happy cow. Not really. I don't typically purchase based on label. I go by company first.
It implies that they care about their animals and the earth. I like this label because it seems friendly.
It implies their animals are happy and their food is organic and good for the Earth. When choosing between two products, the labels do not sway my opinion.
Happy cow. Healthier
It implies that the dairy products are organic, the cows may be given freedom, and at very least implies happy cows. It also implies an environmental focus as well with the earth in the background. I have purchased this product in the past and this is because they provide a lactose free milk product.
I don't know the difference
I don't think the label implies anything about animal treatment, and I wouldn't decide whether to purchase the product based on the label.
Label does not suggest anything to me
Available throughout the world. It is fed organic food. Maybe, I would based on what it was fed.
It looks like a happy cow, but I don't drink cow milk so I wouldn't buy it regardless.
Yes, the cow looks as though it is not confined.
The cow looks happy. I guess that kind of says that they are treated well. I usually buy things based on the price rather than the label or brand.
I have bought this label before because of the label I thought it was better for you, but I didn't like the taste of the product so I didn't buy it no more.

It's cute, so I'm assuming it's supposed to make the customers think their cows are happy and healthy. I wouldn't purchase it over another product because I'm already aware of the brand, and the labeling doesn't really matter much to me. Outside of nutritional information, I couldn't care less what the advertising label looks like.
- animals are treated ethically - label seems cartoonish, which could imply its marketed towards children, meaning its safe/good company If Dean's milk and Horizon were the same price, I would buy Horizon. Less likely to have microorganisms, better quality, and there is a taste difference. I think Horizon may have a longer expiration date as well.
They imply they have "happy cows". So, therefore, worth buying their product because they treat them well.
Well fed, American-bred cows
It seems that the animals are happy and healthy
Suggests the product is organic and the animals are free-range. I would probably not buy this product over another because I typically do not buy organic.
I feel that the logo implies that the company has happy cows. Since they have happier cows, they will have better meat.. I would not purchase this due to the label. It boils down to price.
The cow is "free" and flying around the world - that indicates that products from Horizon come from around the world and probably from more open types of farms than forced, conventional farming. The flying cow indicates freedom for the cow to roam, probably in North and South America, where standards are a bit higher than other countries. The organic flag indicates that the product is organic, but does not clearly indicate what the cow was fed nor how the cow was treated. I always buy organic milk, but not always Horizon. It tends to be a bit more expensive and because they are so large, I can not be sure of their processing.
All of the definitions in this survey are things that I "wish" were true; I just don't believe there are many enforcements, or quantitative measures in place that make me "believe" they're telling the truth. The above label is particularly ridiculous, as nothing "organic" ever displays pure primary colors. It's cartoonish and makes me feel that they are treating me as infantile and that they are trying to pull a "fast one" over me. The statement "certified humane" seems to be the most drastic appeal from the seller to convince the buyer of their sincerity, so I doubt that one least of all.
yes, I almost always buy this Horizon organic milk, partially due to label
No...it's cute, but not impressive or informative
The cow is running and appears to be happy, implying that they treat their animals well. They also have a picture of the planet, suggesting their company is environmentally friendly.
Organic stands out. I think they put a yellow flag around the word "organic" to imply that they are an organic brand. They also make the cow appear to be happy as it proudly holds the flag, making it seem like they are nice to their cows. The world, on the left, kind of confuses me. I don't know if its an international brand or if its just randomly there. If I heard good things about this brand, I would give it a try. However, I wouldn't just buy it because it says organic. I want to know why it's organic.
Yes
Suggests better animal treatment, but I don't know that for sure so I would not purchase the product based on the label
It implies that animals are treated well and lead happy lives, and that all of their products (including all ingredients in "complicated" products like mac & cheese) are organic. I would likely purchase this over a non-organic product, but not necessarily over another organic product.
It promotes being organic and has a happy cow on it. I would purchase it because it says that it is organic.
i do not buy, I purchase a competitors milk. label has a smiling cow who is flying? seems ridiculous
Implication: Carefree animals and animal products, environmentally friendly I purchase Horizon products - probably due to the label.
It implies that the animals are treated better and that it's better for the planet - the label alone would not be enough to sway me one way or the other.

like "world peace" but with animals
The cow's cartoonishness and expression suggests that it's fine with being chopped up into meat or whatever. I wouldn't purchase it because "organic" is a meaningless label and also I'm vegetarian.
It seems to be implying that the animal is happier and more likely treated better because it is "organic". No, I would not base the purchase on the label
The label implies the cow is fed food without anything added, only organic food. It doesn't say if the cow is free range or treated humanely etc just organic, people assume organic means all that. I would buy if the price is right. I am on a strict budget. I rarely buy meat, I use alternative protein sources as much as possible.
No I do research first to find out if the company has the same values that I do about my food source.
yes, seems a little more natural. No, wouldn't make a difference, we purchase our eggs from our neighbor wh works at an chicken farm
It looks like the cow is pretty excited about it's association with being "organic". It looks like it is leaping with joy... and perhaps coincidentally travelling at the planet, Earth. I have seen this label before, and I don't think I ever noticed what was actually depicted. These products are really expensive. I don't think I've ever purchased any of these items before.
Organic is clean fed (approved diets) and animals are only given approved medications.
It looks like it appeals to children. Whenever I see the word organic, I think the manufacturer is jumping on a bandwagon that they should have been on all along if organic products are really that good for us. Seems like a big fad.
Looks like the cow is flying - Implications of freedom/humane treatment. I don't pay attention to graphics on a label. I evaluate nutritional content of food. I am generally not impacted by fancy labels, as there is typically a saturation of fancy labels and nothing really stands out.
The picture represents a "happy cow" so "better milk" This does not necessarily make me want to purchase this product.
Being labeled "Organic", I would assume the food has fewer chemicals and preservatives
The cow looks happy but I would focus more on price and overall taste of product.
Seems fine. I would buy it.
No
Yes; it implies the animals are treated well and chemical free.
This cow is smiling. it must be happy. They must love animals and treat them well... No.
That the animals are given access to the out doors and treated more humanely.
They are attempting to imply happy cows, happy earth. If there was no difference in price, I would purchase this brand.
I would buy it. Less chemicals
Horizon looks like a rand name. Implies nothing.
Label implies that the cows are happier and better cared for. I might purchase this product over another based on the label, but I do not buy organic milk because the expiration date is usually further out than the expiration date on conventional milk brands, which may mean that the organic milk is more heavily processed.
Yes. Health conscious. Safe.
The label implies only that the product is organic and doesn't convey anything about the animals' living conditions or treatment. I would look for additional information on the packaging that describes what the producer means by "organic". If no other information is available, I'd assume only that the producer used the word "organic" as an attention-getter and is otherwise meaningless. This particular label would not influence (either positively or negatively) my purchase decision.
There does seem to be an implication of "friendly" treatment toward animals. I have no idea if I would purchase this product versus another based solely on the label, but I am inclined to say probably not. I tend to stick with specific products, in general.
The product is telling me that it's 100% made from the earth by providing the label with the image of the

earth. I already buy this product not because of the label but because it taste really good
The label seems to suggest that Horizon has organic beef and that their cows are happy and can jump really high. I like happy cows.
Happy cows are are marketing tool. The label would not be a deciding factor.
The label suggests that the happiness of the animal and positive environmental factors are important to the company. I would probably purchase products from this company based on the label.

Table 13: Textual Responses to the Question: "Does the California Milk label seem to suggest or imply any particular message regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well-being? Would you purchase this product over another product due to the label?"

The word "real" here suggests that other milk isn't real, somehow, so what makes milk real? Perhaps a cow standing around outside is the kind of cow that produces "real" milk. This label seems to argue that the company's cows are outside, and apparently not packed in closely with other cows. I seriously doubt that's the case. The word "real" here is meaningless to me, so I'd be less likely to buy it over a product that explained its process to me in more detail.

The best milk is in California. I would not purchase over another due to the label.

no message

Doesn't convey a message based on animal treatment.

No

I don't think of California milk as being particularly good. The label is irrelevant.

The product to me implies that the cows are free range. This label wouldn't make me buy their product.

Seems to imply cows raised on a pasture. Probably not just due to label.

Not necessarily. I would be more likely to purchase milk from the Midwest.

The cow's profile seems positive. I probably would not purchase this product over another product due to the label.

Not artificial

It suggests that the animals maybe get free-range but only based on the graphic. It doesn't say anything about the actual product except that it's "real" maybe implicating that it's organic, but it's not clear. I wouldn't purchase this over others for any particular reason.

The label implies that the products are "real", so they don't use any fillers or anything. I would purchase it if the price was fair.

The label doesn't imply anything to me. I would not purchase this over another product.

This label seems to imply that the cows are able to be outdoors. It gives me the impression that the cows live in a more natural environment than traditional dairies. "Real" also pulls at me. It's like it's suggesting that it is only milk and has no additives or hormones or anything else that would make it not real.

"California" also makes me think "health conscience". I would not purchase this product over another based on the label...unless the other labels were terrible.

Looks natural

no implication

No to the first question. No to the second. Just because California thinks it does wonders for the world doesn't make it true. With a drought over their heads, maybe cattle aren't the best commodity to raise.

No, It tells me nothing, other than it assumes I'm somewhat semi-literate.

The label looks like the cows are outside. No I would not purchase this over another product due to the label because I don't judge my purchases based purely on the look on the label.

The sun indicates the animal has access to outside. It is professional and REAL would you lead you to believe it is a more natural product. Yes, it looks professional.

No

This company's logo seems to show a cow standing outside in the sunshine, which could suggest that this is how they as a company practice and how they treat their animals. Though this may be true, the logo would still not make me more likely to buy the product.

No. The label simply implies that the milk is from California. I would not choose this over another product because of the label.

None whatsoever, except that cows are cool....nothing attracts me, will only buy if price is lower

No it does address treatment or well being. No. and it's stupid all milk is real.

It suggests free-ranging cattle. I would not purchase by label alone, cost and taste are my primary indicators for if I will purchase or not.

It just seems to be a normal pic with not much to be thought about it.

I believe the company is implying that cows are given free range. I have never seen this brand of milk in stores before, so it wouldn't my first choice when purchasing milk.
The label implies their milk is "natural" or real, when others are not. No, I would not purchase this.
No thoughts on treatment, would not purchase.
Since the cow isn't crammed into a cage or feed lot it implies the cows are in the wide open and free to roam.
Nothing on animal treatment. No.
The California Milk Label does not give me a clear impression as to how the company treats their livestock. Also unless the product looks appealing and is of a favorable price, then the label may play a part in my decision to purchase the product, since its catchy.
I dont see any implications
Does not imply any message on animal treatment to me. Would not purchase this product over another due to the label.
I would not purchase this label over another. I don't think there is an implied message.
Doesn't really say anything regarding wellbeing. No. I stick to store brand milk or almond milk.
It does not seem to imply any particular message. It looks like a generic lable. I would not necessarily perches this over any other lable.
The label doesn't imply anything about the animal's well being. I don't choose any product just because of the label.
Strange label, never seen fake milk
It seems to imply a free-range dairy cow. I believe some of their labels say happy cows are California cows. I don't always purchase their products as I have not seen a lactose free product of theirs. I have purchased their "Challenge" butter and the taste is so superior to other butter's I have access to that I don't buy anything else.
I don't know
I don't think the label implies anything about animal treatment, and I wouldn't decide whether to purchase the product based on the label.
The mik is the only real milk that is made However the label would not influence me to buy it
It seems to only say where the milk is from. I wouldn't purchase it based on that alone.
cow looks freer, but not sure what "real" means. i would probably only purchase this if it was cheaper than whatever else I was looking at.
It implies that the milk is "real", as in not tampered with.
The word "real" makes it sound like there is nothing artificial in the milk. Which would say that they are not feeding their cows anything artificial or dangerous. Again I don't really care about labels when I purchase food.
I would not, the label does not suggest that it is better than other brands or that the animals are treated any different.
I'm not sure if it says much about their animal treatment, but maybe something along the lines of "We don't add stuff (like hormones, etc.) to our cows because then they're not REAL." It kinda gives me the vibe like they want to come across that they treat their livestock well, but I'm not sure how. I might buy this over something else because I think it's appealing.
This label doesn't do anything for me. To me, milk from California would mean that I am paying more for shipping/handling of the product versus quality. Cows from California don't mean better cows.
Nope, just cows that live in CA.
This does not resonate. Try the same for Wisconsin. It might elicit a different response!
I might purchase this over another brand because the label seems to suggest that this milk is more organic/ fresh than others.
The "real" on the label suggests the product is natural, or at least made with less additives, because of that, yes I would be more likely to buy this product.
Yes, I think that the logo implies that the company lets their animals roam the outdoors. No I would not

purchase this over another product. It boils down to price.
This label indicates that the cow is free on the range, but the label does not say that. Forced farming takes place all over California, so I can't be sure what is in the carton. I would have to read the label to know what happened to the cow to get the milk. I would not purchase this product over another just because of this label - it would be because of the content and description of how the milk got into the bottle or carton.
No. It doesn't. It looks modeled after a traffic sign. It has the subtle sense that I'm being "commanded" to agree with their message, in the same manner that one is commanded to obey a YIELD sign. It tells me the milk is from California, and that it isn't "fake milk," whatever that would be. In the icon, the cow stares longingly at the rising sun; it's probably a subconscious decision by the marketing "experts" to help assuage their guilt over the fact that their cows probably haven't seen the light of day in years.
no much as I only buy organic milk, don't consider others
I like local...
Not so much the animals' well being, but the quality of their product. I wouldn't purchase it over another product of the same nature.
This brand seems reputable, as it is prominent enough to advertise on television. Using the word, "Real" gives the brand label a trusting appeal. That is about the only thing that makes it sound good.
Suggests NOTHING!!!
Other companies have "fake" milk? No, I would not purchase based on the label
It implies that the animals are free range, grass fed and/or treated well based on the picture, but there is nothing specific in the label that actually indicates any of that. I would only buy this over another if it were cheaper/had a later expiration date.
This company has a reputation for their product and treating their cows properly. Or at least that's what their commercials say
Implication: free-roaming dairy cows, not milk barn stables; "everybody is happy in sunny California - even cows" I might buy this product, because it paints a pretty picture.
It seems to imply that cows are outside in the sunshine - this would not sway me.
Looks expensive, like they want you to know Cali is elite...
I guess the label reassures me that the milk is from cows and from California, but not really anything about how the animals feel. I guess if it was reasonably priced I'd purchase it.
It seems to imply that the animal is frequently outside. No, I would not base the purchase on the label.
It tries to imply a free range cow by standing it out in the pasture with the sun but it doesn't say anything about the product at all, you don't know its just REAL milk, all milk is REAL some have added hormones etc you can't tell from this label. I don't drink much animal milk, usually coconut milk so I wouldn't buy it.
No because to me it suggests that the milk came from California. I would have to do more research.
No, no suggestions about treatment of animals. No, I buy the cheapest milk.
It seems like they think California milk is somehow superior to milk that originates from other states. This is kind of weird. Like California needs to claim something else? Why dairy? Let Wisconsin have what is rightfully theirs. The cow looks pretty basic. Pretty stoic. It is up at the crack of dawn like some military veteran put out to pasture but can't shake the habit. What a trooper. What a soldier. That cow has a sense of duty. That cow is loyal and proud. How #blessed that cow is to accept this job!
It means the California Dairy Farmers pay for this labeling, it is marketing. I am an Indiana Dairy Farmer.
No preference one way or the other on this one
It seems that I should be intrigued by the fact that the milk comes from cows that were raised on California farms...? There doesn't seem to be any implication about the company's thoughts on treatment or well-being. This would not affect my likelihood to buy this product.
I believe this picture is letting people know that cows are also raised in California. Most people believe that cows are only raised in the Midwest. Doesn't make me want to buy

I am very cynical when it comes to labels and packaging. I would not normally assume that just because there is a happy cow on the label the milk was from "actual" happy cows. I would not purchase this solely based on the assumption that the cows were treated better than a standard dairy farm.
It appears the cow is given a natural environment but I would look at price.
Seems misleading. I would not buy it.
no
Yes, it implies freedom, (non-CAFO).
They use real cows in a real way. They respect cows. No.
This only suggest that the animals are from CA.
This label does not communicate anything to me about the treatment of animals. I would not choose this product over another, even if the price was the same.
no
Again - milk from california, NO message.
The cow pictured is on open pasture in sunlight, which indicates that animal well-being is important. I might purchase this product over others based on the label.
All natural. Organic. Safe.
I draw no inferences from the label other than the product is milk (or made from milk...depending upon the product on which the label appears). This particular label would not influence (either positively or negatively) my purchase decision.
There does seem to be an implication of "friendly" treatment toward animals. I have no idea if I would purchase this product versus another based solely on the label, but I am inclined to say probably not. I tend to stick with specific products, in general.
This label implies that the cow in the picture is free range and that there is no hormones in their milk. The sun represents the freedom to the cow.
The label seems to suggest that California Milk is from cows that like to watch sunrises but does not suggest that their milk is any better or different than milk from Wisconsin cows that watch sunsets.
This doesn't seem to imply anything in particular about the treatment of the animals. The label itself would not drive my purchase.
The label seems to imply that its cows are free range, but since it doesn't specifically state that, I wouldn't trust that assumption. I would not necessarily opt for this product just because of the label.
As opposed to fake milk? I would purchase another product over this one. My family were dairy farmers in Wisconsin so I prefer my dairy products from there.
It suggests that their animals are free range (freely roaming a pasture of grass with sun coming up over the fields), and therefore implies that they are grass-fed and live in a 'natural' environment. (However, the sign is also reminiscent of a road sign...). I do not consume / purchase milk so I can't honestly respond to the purchasing part of this question, but I would (and do) make a point of purchasing products from companies that claim humane practices.
The label encourages the customer to believe that this company believes that cows, in their natural environment (the outdoors), is a better cow, ergo, better milk. I probably would buy this one over other brands if I did not know the other brands.

Table 14: Textual Responses to the Question: "Does the Eckrich label seem to suggest or imply any particular message regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well-being? Would you purchase this product over another product due to the label?"

"Since 1894" is meant, I suppose, to hearken back to a simpler time, when the farmhouse and the single-family farm was the norm (though I'm not sure that's how it actually ever was). This label suggests that the same family has been doing this since that simpler time, which might make you think that the animals would be treated more carefully and not packed into feedlots. But, again, I'm unlikely to make a purchase of an animal product without information about its production practices made fairly clear.
They've been around a long time. I would consider purchasing over another label because of the length of time they've been around. This does not mean, however, that they're the best. There is nothing that implies the company's thoughts on animal treat or well-being.
no message
No
I don't think it suggests anything about the treatment of animals. I think their products are often good.
The label here implies a small business and farm. This label doesn't make me want to buy their product more.
No implication on animal treatment.
No message suggesting animal treatment. I am vey familiar with the label having seen it in grocery stores for a long time. I would purchase this over some off brands or some strore brands.
It does not seem to imply anything about the company's thoughts on animal treatment/well-being. I would not purchase this product over another product because all I know is how old the company is.
The date implies they haven't changed their standards
The label doesn't suggest anything about their thoughts on animal treatment of well-being. I wouldn't purchase this over another product due to the label, except maybe based on my familiarity with the brand.
The label doesn't really imply anything. I would purchase it if the price was fair.
The label doesn't imply anything to me. I would not purchase this over another product due to the label.
It implies something of home and experience. I can take the long-standing tradition of the company and think that they have good practices because of their history (e.g. they've ironed out the kinks). But since it's an old company, I can think that maybe they fell away from the more natural processes of the late 19th century and got swept up in the cheaper processes created in the 20th century. Maybe they are not as up with the health- and animal-awareness times. The label does not make me want to buy the product solely for the label. I wouldn't not buy the product either. Because the brand is unknown to me, I probably wouldn't select it over another without asking someone first.
Never seen before
no implication
Eckrich seems corporate, industrial, and affordable. I'll buy it, but only because it's cheaper, and it's cheaper for a reason.
No message implied. I would not purchase it over another due to this label. It simply tells me to believe in their name for quality.
Not he label does not seem to suggest anything. I would not purchase this over another product due to the label.
No, no it does not imply much at all.
no
This logo doesn't seem to suggest anything about the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well being. I would not be more likely to purchase this product over another simply because of the label.
There is no implication whatsoever regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment. I would not purchase this product over another because of the label. It only states the year the company was founded.
None about how nice they are to the pigs. Have used Eckrich products before and been satisfied, so I would pay small premium over unknown brand
No. no

No thoughts on the label, I enjoy and prefer eckrich meats as their flavor and quality is superior in my opinion.
I think age of establishment gives authenticity, nothing else.
The lack of any animals in the label implies the company's focus is not on safe treatment of animals. I would not purchase from this company because I personally dislike their products. Their meats are very greasy and fattening, and the taste is not pleasant.
No, I don't think there is any message regarding animal treatment or well being. I would not purchase this product because of the label.
This has no animal in it so it's hard for a ignorant consumer to connect an animal with this company but I would never purchase from them. I don't eat pig.
Like every other meat manufacturer they try to convey the "down home family farm" instead of mass production that actually happens. Like before, no, I would not buy any products from this company
Nothing on animal treatment. No.
The label absolutely implies nothing about the company. No I would not purchase the product over another due to the label. The price is what would concern me the most.
I dont see any implications
Does not imply any message on animal treatment. Purchase on the basis of the label only becuae I think of it as quality meat.
No implications. I would not necessarily purchase this over another label.
No. Doesn't really imply anything on animal wellbeing. Yes, I would purchase product because it's a brand I grew up with.
This is a generic lable and does not send any strong messages. I would not purchase this product over any others.
The label doesn't imply any message about the company's thoughts on animal treathment. I do not use labels to help make decisions.
Does not imply animal treatment, just been in business a long time, and should be "trusted"
The label doesn't say much to me, it seems industrial in a way. If anything about their products implies anything to me it's their prices. Eckrich is one of the cheapest meat products in the grocery stores and that always concerns me. To me, it implies that the keep their animals and tightly packed over crowded super farms and the meat products themselves probably contain a large percentage of fillers like water and or "pink-slime."
I don't know
I don't think the label implies anything about animal treatment, and I wouldn't decide whether to purchase the product based on the label.
No
It seeems to just be a company label. It doesn't say anything about treatment. It is a "name brand" but I wouldn't see it as more humane than another. No, it wouldn't sway me.
I don't think it portrays anything about the company's thoughts about animal treatment. just looks like a name.
No, this doesn't imply anything in particular.
If I didn't know any better, I wouldn't know that this was even a brand that sells animal products. It says nothing about animals.
I would simply because its a trusted brand that i have always bought and my family bought.
Eckrich doesn't imply anything other than they've been around for a while. I'm sure their animal treatment is fair, but it's not the focal point of who they are as a business/company. The label doesn't really mean much to me, but the name is something I like and am familiar with, so I'd buy it over another product in that sense.
I don't purchase this product due a bad experience before. Their label seems to indicate their products are similar to what you would make in your home, or what your family would use. The date gives reference to their reputation.

I would say this has a negative impact on me. I see industrial farming practices, animals that don't live while they are alive, etc.
A pork product? I do not eat pork.
No. This label do not make me think of anything to do with animals and how they are treated. I may pick another brand
The label is relatively plain and doesn't seem to suggest much on their views of animal treatment. No I would not buy product with this label.
Since the letter "E" on the logo is inside a building, I would guess that their animals are kept inside all the time. Again, boild down to price.
Eckrich is about big farming - no matter the treatment of the animal. They produce LOTS of processed meats that contain MSG and other chemicals. Most of their meats are not natural. I would purchase this label if I were traveling and didn't have a knowledge of what was available in the area.
Yes. The "since 1894" suggests that they have been doing things "the same way" now for over a dozen decades. I NEVER buy Eckrich products.
maybe, because 1894 indicate the history and quality
I like local
I wouldn't say there is a message about the treatment of their animals, but that they are a wholesome, homey company beause the house and longevity of their company.
The only thing that looks good here is they included the year it wear founded. Other than that, I don't think this label is implying anything.
It's largely crap--but I sometimes buy it. It's BIG Ag big time!!!!
No suggestion of animal treatment
It doesn't appear to apply anything in regards to animal treatment or well-being, and I would not feel especially compelled to buy it based on the label alone.
This company is typically cheap. Does not promote any organic or natural aspects on it's label though
What comes to mind when I see the Eckrich label is hot dogs and bologna - the label is nothing overly impressive. I typically do not buy any meat products from this company.
No message about animal well-being, though the house seems to suggest "family values." No I would not.
None, too traditional for that humane \$h!t
No, and no. I don't eat meat.
No. No, I would not base the purchase on the label.
I would not purchase because it says Eckrich. I would look at the nutrition label and pick the one with less sodium, calories etc. People think the label is a reason to buy, not so if you ask me. Read the ingredients, it's probably all mechanically dismembered just because it's Eckrich doesn't mean its humane treatment.
Due to the label I would choose this one. My dad use to work for them and this was the staple in the house. Dad knew about the company values at the time.
no message about treatment of animals. Yes, I would buy if wanted their meat.
I have no reflection on this company's view on animal treatment or well being.
No, it suggests they have been in business a long time.
Would buy because it is a brand I am familiar with
No message. Just Eckrich... you should know us by now. (Since 1894). This would not affect my likelihood to buy the product.
The date lets you know the product has been around for a long time. The house depicted gives you a more "down on the farm" feel. It makes you feel as if you are getting items from a good ol farmer My younger brother will only eat eckrich hot dogs (lol). So that is the only kind I buy.
This is an old label I've seen many times, and I don't think it implies any message concerning how they treat their animals.
No message. I would most likely purchase due to it being a popular brand that my family has always purchased.

I would not buy this product. Nothing leads me to believe it is high quality.
no
It doesn't really imply a message, but it is a well established company that we would probably 'trust'.
No. I know Eckrich is decent. I might purchase this for the name.
No it doesn't. Having a starting date for the company doesn't mean that their practices haven't changed over the years.
This label does not communicate anything to me about the treatment of animals. I would not choose this product over another, even if the price was the same.
tradition No, too many nitrates
Firm has survived. The product has some value.
No, it does not. The label provides the name of the company, it's founding year, and a house logo, which indicate that Eckrich may be a long-standing, family brand. There is nothing to indicate the company message on animals. I would not choose this product over another based solely on label.
No.
In a word, no. Other than the fact that the label let's me know the product was produced by Eckrich, the label would not influence my purchase decision.
Not really. Yes, I have, and will purchase this product versus another. In this case, it has to do with flavor. Store-brand products sometimes do not taste as good.
The little farm house at the top doesn't really make me feel anything. Most animals have shelter.
The Eckrich label does not suggest any product(s) at all and certainly no implication of animal treatment or well-being.
Nothing here about the treatment of animals is obvious to me. This would not drive my purchase of the product.
No, the label doesn't give any indication on animal treatment. Since it's such a large company, I would assume animal treatment is not as high a priority. I would not necessarily opt for this product just because of the label.
Implies family farm, maybe better treatment with small operation? I don't think this label would have much effect on my purchase decision.
The Eckrich label does not seem to imply or suggest anything regarding animal treatment or well being. This product bears a well-known label / familiar label which may influence my decision over another product, however, I would not purchase this product over a product that was produced humanely if available.
This label does not show any thoughts on the company's idea of animal treatment or well being. I probably would not buy this product over others.
No, images on labels do not sway my opinion

Table 15: Textual Responses to the Question: "Does the Hillshire Farm label seem to suggest or imply any particular message regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well-being? Would you purchase this product over another product due to the label?"

This label implies the same single-family farm values of the 30s are used to produce these products. Ostensibly, those values involved caring more closely for the animals and using fewer chemicals, but I have reason to believe that Hillshire Farm is only nominally committed to the humane treatment of animals just from my own research. The label doesn't include any details about production practices, so, no, it's not something I'd be likely to buy.
No, nothing to implicate a message regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well-being. Would more than likely not purchase over Eckrich.
no message
No
I do not see any implication concerning animal treatment. I have a neutral impression of the product.
This label tries to make them seem like a small business and farm. It doesn't make me want to buy their products.
No implication on animal treatment.
I suppose the message is that the animals under this brand are raised on a traditional farm and out of doors. Once again I would purchase this brand over some off brands or store brands
This label does not seem to imply anything about the company's thoughts on animal treatment/well-being. I would not purchase this product over another product because all I know is how old the company is.
Date is a good sign
The label doesn't imply anything about animal treatment or well-being. I wouldn't purchase this over another product due to the label, except maybe based on my familiarity with the brand.
The label implies that the products come from farms. Would purchase if the price was fair.
The label doesn't imply anything to me. I would not purchase this over another product due to the label.
It implies farm living to me. I want to imagine fresh and healthy food and animals, but for some reason Hillshire Farm does not instill confidence in me as a buyer when it comes to organic, non-GMO, humane, etc. food. I'd buy it because it is a known brand, not because it is all kinds of healthy.
Looks like "wholesome," family owned farm
no implication but I associate this label with a processed food product
I put them below Eckrich, and I don't buy any of their products.
No message other than that they've been growing or raising their product for 81 years.
The label does not seem to suggest anything. I would not purchase this over another product due to the label.
The year of establishment leads you to think animals are treated more humanely and as if they were being raised on a traditional farm, not mass produced. The barn implies the same thing. Yes, it is wholesome looking.
No
I don't think that this logo displays any kind of message on how this company treats their animals. Though a barn is shown in the logo, it has no indication on what the company believes regarding access to the outdoors and such. This logo wouldn't make me more likely to buy the product.
There is no implication whatsoever regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment. I would not purchase this product over another because of the label. It only states the year the company was founded.
None about how nice they are to the pigs. Have used Hillshire Farms products before and been satisfied, so I would pay small premium over unknown brand
No, no
It suggests a good old-fashioned farm. I recognize the label as something my parents buy, and so I would be more inclined to buy it for its label recognition over brands I didn't know.
No message about animal treatment (may be the farm part could mean something)
The lack of any animals in the label implies the company's focus is not on safe treatment of animals. I

would not purchase this product based on the sodium and fat content of the foods.
There is some implication that Hillshire Farm is a local, family owned business because of the picture of the barn. Some might infer that this means better treatment for the animals. No, I would not purchase something because of this label.
No message, it would be helpful if you would tell us what products they sell in here. There is no product on the label.
Again, the old time family farm lie.
Nothing on animal treatment. Yes.
The words 'Hillshire Farm' present a message of a prestigious well managed, home type farm. I would probably purchase this product due to the label.
It implies that this food comes from a little red barn how cute
Does not imply a message on animal treatment. I purchase this brand on occasion due to the level of quality I associate with it.
That they are a family-friendly farm. I would not purchase this over another label.
Doesn't really imply anything regarding treatment of animals. Yes, because it's a familiar brand.
This label seems to imply a healthier environment because of the quaint barn scene. I might purchase this one over other products.
It implies nothing about their thoughts on animal treatment. Labels don't affect my opinions.
Does not imply animal treatment, just been in business a long time, and should be "trusted"
The packaging says nothing to me about how they treat their animals. Even if the company came out with a "free-range" or "organic" or "natural" or even "non-GMO" line of meat products I would be skeptical about the truth behind those statements. The company is huge and while not the cheapest meat product in the grocery store, it isn't costly either. Over crowded super farms are usually the only reason prices can be kept low.
I don't know
I don't think the label implies anything about animal treatment, and I wouldn't decide whether to purchase the product based on the label.
no
Same as #37
looks like a big farm, don't think it really speaks to the company's thoughts about animal treatment or well being
It seems to imply real farms are used not industrialized farms.
It sounds like a family farm that has been around forever. I am not sure why, but I get the impression that they care about their animals and treat them well.
This is the same thing it is an old trusted brand so yes i would buy it
Hillshire Farm, like Eckrich, doesn't show much care or thought for their animal treatment being shown on their packaging. I'm sure having "Farm" in the name with a little farm in the label is supposed to make the buyer think it's more down-to-earth. I wouldn't buy this over another product because the label doesn't have any appeal.
Same answer as #37, industrial farming.
Little difference.
It seems like a happy farm and has been around a long time. it may be a trustworthy brand
The picture of the farm suggests the company does "care" about how the animals are treated. Yes, I would buy product from this label because it is familiar to me.
I think that the logo implies that the animals are farm grown. Again, everything boils down to price.
Hillshire Farms is also large farming. Their label is a bit more enticing than the Eckrich label, but still indicates standard practices in meat production. Again, they use a lot of chemicals in the processing of their meats. When comparing this to Eckrich, I would purchase Hillshire Farm meats instead.
Same as the preceding label; just 40 years newer. I don't buy this brand either.

yes, maybe, looks green
I like local
It implies that the company uses the same, more-humane practices of a small family farm, treating their animals better than a factory.
They use a lot of green to show a kind of eco-friendly and humane appeal. They also included the year they were founded. The farm they added on the label also looks friendly and animal friendly. I think I would purchase this brand over others because it's on the television a lot.
Nope .Nice bucolic label signifying nothing.
No suggestion of animal treatment
The image implies an idyllic farm, but again there are no words implying anything about animal treatment or well-being and I would likely not be especially compelled to buy the product based on the label.
This label/company does not show any ideas of being a better product than others
It looks like a nice little farm with happy animals, but their products are completely over-processed. Maybe only a step above Eckrich farms smokey links and olive bologna. I don't buy lunch meat or other products with this label.
It seems to evoke a traditional view of farms - this label would not promote my purchasing choice.
nope, traditional
Farm implies that the animals would be treated well and given space to do their thing, but it's probably a marketing ploy. No. I'm vegetarian.
It seems to suggest older methods of farming, i.e. not factory farms. No, I would not base the purchase on the label.
I would not purchase because it says Hillshire Farms. I would look at the nutrition label and pick the one with less sodium, calories etc. People think the label is a reason to buy, not so if you ask me. Read the ingredients, it's probably all mechanically dismembered just because it's Hillshire Farm with the cutsie barn and field of greens doesn't mean its humane treatment.
I would have to do more research.
not at all, Would buy if wanted the meat
I have no reflection on this company's view on animal treatment or well being.
No, it suggests they have been in business a long time.
Am familiar with the brand and may buy based on price and selection
No, just a little colorful and eye-catching. It may get me to look at the product, but I wouldn't buy the product due to the label alone.
Similar as above about the date and picture. It makes you think the product is coming from next door.
Just because there is a happy red barn on the Hillshire Farm logo, I do not think that somewhere in Iowa there is an actual "Hillshire Farm" just a graphic designer behind a desk. I would buy this product if I liked the taste. Their label says nothing about their thoughts on animal cruelty.
No message but would purchase due to being a popular brand.
I would not buy this product. Nothing leads me to believe it is high quality.
no
It doesn't really imply a message, but it is a well established company that we would probably 'trust'.
The barn looks nice. Maybe the animals love it there... No.
It looks comforting but still doesn't tell us anything about the treatment of the animals.
This label does not communicate anything to me about the treatment of animals. I would not choose this product over another, even if the price was the same.
tradition no too many nitrates
Has been in business. Product must have some vlaue.
The farm on the logo is an old-style small farm, which implies that the animals could be sourced from small producers, but that's unlikely. I would not choose this product over another based solely on label.

Safe. ComfoRT.
Again, no.. Other than the fact that the label let's me know the product was produced by Hillshire Farm, the label would not influence my purchase decision.
Not specifically animal treatment, no. And yes, I will purchase this product versus another based on experience with the product and flavor.
This label tells me there is free range animals because there's a nice picture of a full field for animals to roam.
The Hillshire Farm label seems to suggest a small traditional farm but nothing concerning animal treatment or well-being. I don't see any animals roaming around outside the barn. Whether I would purchase a Hillshire Farm product label over another product label depends on the other label.
Nothing here about the treatment of animals is obvious to me. The brand behind the lable might make it more appealing to purchase than another company's product at the identical price point.
The farm image seems to indicate a positive image on animal treatment, but since it's such a large company, I would assume animal treatment is not as high a priority. I would not necessarily opt for this product just because of the label.
Seems to imply small family farm where animals would be treated well, but not isn't really the case. No.
The 'homey' traditional farm pictured within the label suggests free-range, grass-fed, etc. farming practices ('old-school', traditional, natural / non-commercialized methods / practices). Again, this product bears a well-known label / familiar label which may influence my decision over another product, however, I would not purchase this product over a product that was known to be produced humanely if available.
This label does not show any particular message in regards to the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well being. I do purchase this brand, but not because of the label.
No, images on labels do not sway my opinion
Known brand. Original?

Table 16: Textual Responses to the Question: "Does the Egg Land's Best label seem to suggest or imply any particular message regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well-being? Would you purchase this product over another product due to the label?"

Cage free and vegetarian fed sound like details that should matter to me, because I worry about battery cages. I wish I could say that "cage free" is enough to make me think these hens fare better than hens in battery cages, but it's my understanding that cage free doesn't mean much in terms of chicken misery. So I wouldn't buy these eggs based on the label. Cage free doesn't mean enough to me.

This packaging is full of information on how they treat their chickens. Vegetarian fed, cage-free, etc. If I can afford it, I usually purchase this brand over any other.

I buy these! It implies animals are healthy and happy.

Cage free seems to imply more humane

It implies that the hens are better treated and fed in a way that is safer for the consumer. I do not know whether to believe it. I tend to get this product because the package is not made of styrofoam. My egg-purchasing criteria are that I purchase the least expensive eggs that are not packaged in styrofoam.

It implies that the cage free eggs are better for you than regular eggs. The packaging has all of the vitamin information so large that you think it has more nutritional value over regular eggs which they don't. I wouldn't buy this over other eggs.

I may buy this one because I tend toward cage free eggs.

Ah ha, you have caught me. Yes, this container seems to suggest that the chickens have free access to the out of doors. My husband's family raised eggs when he was growing up and he does not put much stock in the added health benefits of brown eggs..

It seems to suggest that the company cares about the treatment and well-being of its animals because the chickens are cage free and vegetarian fed. I would be more likely to purchase this product over another product due to the label if the prices were comparable because I like the idea of cage free chickens.

Not cooped up

This label does say things about animal treatment of well-being. The label says "vegetarian fed" hens and "cage-free" indicating that the hens are fed perhaps a better diet and aren't in cages, but it doesn't indicate that the hens have free-range or what their diet is or any other humane practices. Overall, it says more about the company's marketing to consumers who are interested in humane treatment of animals more so than how they're actually treating the animals. It doesn't really explain. I might purchase these eggs over other eggs because of this, but I'm probably more likely to stick to what I typically get because it's not really explained how they treat the hens.

The label implies that the product is cage free, so the chickens it comes from are not in cages. I would but if the price was fair. T

Yes, they are concerned about the well being of the chickens. I would not purchase this over another product due to the label.

This label suggests that their hens are healthy. They are cage free, they are fed a vegetarian diet (even though I'm pretty sure that chickens eat bugs as part of their natural diet, so I'm not sure why they are boasting about the veggie fed). It was voted product of the year. It says all good things to me. Except that makes me suspicious. Why would they put their eggs in a plastic container? Don't they know that's bad for the environment? If they are so "aware", why aren't they aware of other things? And why do their eggs stay fresher longer? Is that because of something they give the hens? Or is it because the plastic container does something? This package also communicates to me that this company is trying too hard. The package is busy and has a lot of confusing messages. But, if I could afford expensive eggs, I would choose these, I guess.

That cage free is better

no but I would not purchase these eggs

Eggland seems corporate, so I don't buy it if there are local options.

Cage free might not tell me other conditions, but I like the idea that the hens are not confined in tight cages. I would consider other product's labels before making a decision. EB sure advertises enough!

They bore me.
The England's best logo itself does not seem to suggest anything. I would not purchase this over another product due to the label.
cage free and farm fresh suggest the product is fresh and handled appropriately; the feeding method is also explained. Yes, it gives the information on the label.
No
Since this company clearly and largely displays the fact that these eggs are made from cage-free chickens, this may display as a company that they care about that fact and believe it to be the right way to go about egg farming. I would be more likely to buy this product if I saw that the chickens were cage-free, but only if the price was affordable for me.
Yes. It very clearly states the eggs are "Cage Free" and the hens received a vegetarian diet. I would possibly purchase these eggs over others because of the information provided.
They are nice to their chickens allegedly. Would buy for Omega 3's and stays fresher longer, but would pay very little in premium
No no
The label suggests the hens are cage-free. Quality for price would make my decision if I should purchase this over a different brand, not the conditions the hens were raised in.
I think vitamin content and freshness guarantee is all that matters.
Yes -- the label suggests that animals are not raised in cages. This would influence me to buy the eggs.
This company is trying their best to be cage free but they could still do better. I get from the label they are trying to convince the public they are humane to their animals. What I want to know is can we see closed circuit tv to their factory and all places where the hens are located? I purchase their liquid egg whites. I am trying to find a vegan alternative.
The pseudo-stamp of quality and meaningless phrases imply these come from hens that were loved and enjoyed life. Also, as before, no, I would not purchase any animal products of any kind.
Yes. Chicken are able to move and not kept in small cages. Yes
Seems like they care a lot about their product and their consumer
Does imply the company's thoughts on animal treatment. Would not purchase just because of the label.
I don't see a message on animal treatment. I would not buy this over another brand.
Yes, I feel like the chickens have a better life living cage free I purchase this brand all the time.
This logo could imply a seal of approval that they are healthy. I might purchase this product over others.
The label implies the company cares more about their animals than other's because theirs are 'cage free'. I wouldn't choose this over another product because I do not know the requirements for being able to put 'cage free on a label'. It could just mean no metal cages.
Better treatment of chickens. I would purchase
The packaging says all kinds of good things; "Vegetarian Fed," "Cage Free," farm fresh," and even a list of nutrients. I've always wondered how they can claim that their eggs have less saturated fats than other eggs (could be the breed of chicken); and now I'm raising an eyebrow to why they can make the claim that their eggs can "now stay fresher longer." I know that in American mass egg production, the cuticle of the egg is scrubbed away which makes it so that we have to keep our eggs refrigerated and they have less "shelf-life." Reading this label I would wonder if this means these eggs still have their cuticle (or more of it anyway) or if they added some sort of preservative to the egg. I would probably research their claims before buying this product; especially since I've been aware that Egg-land's Best eggs has been notorious for horrible animal treatment in the past.
I don't know
The label does seem to suggest the company cares about the treatment of chickens. I would buy this product if the expiration date and price were acceptable.
Thier eggs have best vitamins in them
I do buy this product because I believe the animals are treated better.
makes it pretty apparent that their eggs are cage free. maybe because they're cage free they stay fresher

longer? would buy this if it was cheaper than the regular eggs.
This implies that the hens are uncaged.
Cage free makes me think they are taking good care of their birds.
i might just because it has some nutrition facts on the front
I think it implies by having the nutritional values like "Excellent source of _____, and 25% less saturated fat than regular eggs" it's superior to other egg brands. I seriously doubt changing where the birds live changes the nutritional value so significantly; it might just be how their brand raises them. I wouldn't buy it over another label because it's bland and there's too much going on. I think it also kinda gives the vibe of "Hey, we do vegetarian things and the like too!"
Cage free: marketing directed towards their treatment of animals Vegetarian fed hens: would assume that means they aren't receiving hormones
Yes, they imply cage free - in it's best definition. Chickens that can roam, peck, choose to be where they want and that have safe haven at night.
Price might come into it here.
The cage free leads me to believe that the chickens are treated well and the well being is important to the company. I may purchase this over another brand.
Clearly, the label focuses on the fact that the product is cage-free which suggests the company treats their animals well. I would buy this product.
the packaging implies that the farm fresh eggs that are cage free stay fresher longer. Again, boils down to price.
This carton is well labeled, making the fine print large. Their advertising campaigns indicate that their eggs are raised in a more humane way (although cage free doesn't necessarily mean enough room to move and not be force fed!). By looking at the label, I would assume that they feed their birds vitamins to increase the vitamin content of the eggs - probably not a very good practice. Also, once a company grows large enough to do national advertising, I shy away from them. National size generally means they are going to cut corners, just doing the bare minimum to meet the standard for whatever their label says.
They claim their hens are vegetarian-fed, and that they are cage-free. Really? 100% organic vegetarian-fed? They weren't in a cage; never, seldom? How much space and sunlight did they actually get? I might buy this if it were the only choice other than the standard unmarked-anything eggs.
yes, cage free and Vegetarian Fed catch my eyes
I have my own chickens and gather my own eggs... all those questions about eggs were not meaningful for me
The cage-free implies that they are kept in natural spaces where they can be happy, while the vegetarian fed hens implies that they are being fed a natural, nutritious diet. Farm fresh applied that they came from a small family farm instead of a factory.
They make "Cage Free" pretty obvious. They want their consumers to know they are treating their chickens relatively better and have some type of standards. I would purchase this because it has a humane appeal, plus I've heard of this brand before.
Seems to indicate a more humane egg process. Would probably purchase.
Cage free suggests better animal treatment. "stays fresh longer" makes me wonder if the eggs have been stored longer?
Honestly, this product just looks like it's over-compensating for something. I likely would choose a different organic egg product over this one if such an option were available (especially a local option). "Farm fresh" means nothing when you break it down into regulations, "cage-free" is an unclear label because (if I'm remembering correctly) it doesn't actually require any specific amount of time and space for the hens to be able to move around or act naturally, "vegetarian fed" actually goes against a chicken's natural diet of bugs, and the claims of staying fresher longer and more nutrients than other eggs makes me think there might actually be some sort of unnatural additive/GMO/steroid component going on here. Plus their commercials are annoying.
The packaging has lots of information about being "cage free" and "stays fresher longer" so I would

purchase this over other products
i buy these. they taste good.
I typically purchase Egg-Land's Best eggs. From the packaging, I feel like the chicken's are kept and treated better. Vegetarian fed, cage free advertising paints a pretty good picture.
It has the appropriate buzzwords but doesn't say anything about actual treatment to me - I would not buy this product over another based on the label.
Compared to the other egg cartons on the shelf, this just looks like it cares more about everything
The company believes it's treating the animals well and how that somehow makes the eggs' shelf life longer. I probably wouldn't purchase it because the packaging alone would make the price go up.
The large "cage free" label implies that the chickens are free to roam. No, I would not necessarily purchase this because of the label; I'm not sure about the "vegetarian fed hens" label.
This label says cage free, it says brown eggs, it says excellent source of vitamins and omega 3 fats, it says vegetarian fed hens etc so it probably treats it's chickens better than the rest. I don't buy EB eggs they cost too much and I don't see the difference in flavor, some people say brown eggs are better, my friend has chickens and sells eggs but they all taste like eggs to me.
It states the layers were cage free and fed a vegetarian diet. I would buy this product if I couldn't find a free range organic farmer in my area.
yes, it does suggest they aren't in cages. No, I purchase eggs from my neighbor who works at a chicken farm
This package is overwhelming. The selling points are extensive and it is difficult to maintain attention to one over the other. The "Cage Free" stands out to me and it would likely contribute to the final decision I would make regarding these egg purchases.
This label suggests many things. Cage Free does not mean the hens are not confined. As a farmer I am interested to know how they can make an egg "stay fresh longer".
I don't buy this product because it is way more expensive even with coupons.
If I care to read all of that information, it seems that this company wants consumers to know its thoughts on animal treatment and well being. Depending on the price vs. what I normally purchase, I might be willing to try this due to the label.
The label implies cage free and vegetarian fed. This truly implies healthy and free hens. Does not make me want to buy. We get eggs from a friend that raises chickens so I am not worried about this.
These are actually the eggs I always buy. I like that they are "cage free" (even though I honestly don't know what regulates the meaning of "cage free") I feel that if an extra .75 or 1.00 paid will help hens have a little better life, I'm willing to pay. Also, I love the taste of these eggs. The yolks are orange and rich and delicious. I can definitely tell a difference in the taste quality vs. standard white eggs.
Stating cage free and vegetarian fed hens. For the right price I would purchase.
Yes, I would buy this product and I have before.
no
Yes, we do purchase this product. Cage Free implies humane animal treatment.
The giant "Cage Free" label suggests that they treat chickens well. No.
Yes. The consumer should be able to trust EB because of the info provided on the label.
Cage-free creates a picture in my mind of chickens roaming free in a grassy field. If the cost was the same, I would choose this over another product, mostly because of the extra nutritional value.
different raising and diet, I might purchase it.
Cage free + all those extras. Seems worthwhile. We buy this.
The label implies that the hens are not caged and are fed a plant-based diet. I assume that means no insects, so they probably are not foraging outdoors. I might buy this product over another based on the label.
Health conscious. Natural. Safe.
This label suggests the chickens are treated differently than those producing eggs in the more traditional sense (caged in a chicken-house). The implication is that the chickens are allowed to "run around the

chicken coop" and are fed vegetarian diet. I believe and rely on the vegetarian diet message, but I'm reasonably certain "cage free" is open to interpretation and that the chickens are most likely confined more so than the "cage free" reference implies.
The label clearly states that the eggs come from Cage-free hens and that they were vegetarian-fed also. I seriously doubt I would ever buy this brand simply because it is so expensive.
This label tells me that the chickens are free range. I buy these eggs sometimes. My mother always said they were the best eggs and that the taste was definitely different.
The Egg Land's Best states that their hens are cage-free and vegetarian fed which is more restrictive than free-range and bug and worm and vegetable fed. Whether I would purchase an Egg Land's Best product label over another product label depends on the other label.
Nothing here about the treatment of animals is obvious to me. However, the vitamin and overall cues from the labeling (cage free, vegetarian fed, etc.) would result in a purchase if the pricing was the same as the regular eggs (store brand).
Because the label indicates "cage free" and "vegetarian fed hens" I would be more likely to choose this product.
Seems to imply that animals are well treated due to being cage free. No, I prefer to purchase organic eggs.
The label (logo) in and of itself, no, (unless a consumer were to associate the word / phrase "Quality" / "Quality Approved" with the care of the animals producing the egg. The packaging as a whole, with the "Cage Free" ribbon floating brightly across the front, would suggest humane treatment for the birds. Though I don't know exactly what "Cage Free" means, I would buy this over another product, making that decision based on the belief (hope) that the animals were treated humanely or more humanely.
Egg Land's Best makes it known that these eggs came from a cage-free environment. They seem proud of that fact. I do purchase these eggs because of the label- I know that I'm making a better choice over non-cage-free.
No, images on labels do not sway my opinion
Quality of life for chicken is implied to be better than avg. chicken

Table 17: Textual Responses to the Question: "Does the Perdue label seem to suggest or imply any particular message regarding the company's thoughts on animal treatment or well-being? Would you purchase this product over another product due to the label?"

This label seems to suggest open grazing for animals. BUt without other details, I wouldn't purchase a product just based on this label.
The farmhouse picture makes one to believe they grow all their meat on little farms such as this. I've not been impressed by this company and their branding tactics.
Won't buy, I've read they are cruel to their chickens.
Trys to convey a natural homey farm environment. Very picturesque and ironic given Perdue's horrible treatment practices. If I had a better option I wouldn't buy Perdue. But based on label alone it's appealing.
No
I get whatever is available that has the product that I want. There is usually little choicfe. I do not make any inference from the label regarding animal treatment.
This label implies it is a small family business. I wouldn't buy this over another brand because of the label.
Yes, this label suggests that the animals would be raised on the traditional farm and the animals would not be caged, but have free access to the out of doors. I don't see this brand in the stores where I shop that often. In the recesses of my mind, I have something that connects this brand with some political wrong doing. I have purchased this product while on vacation, but that's all.
It does not seem to imply anything about the company's thoughts on animal treatment/well-being. I would not purchase this product over another product.
Looks like it's a big free farm.
This label doesn't say anything about animal care practices. I wouldn't purchase this over another product due to the label, except maybe based on my familiarity with the brand.
The label doesn't give any messages. Would purchase if the price was good.
The label doesn't imply anything to me. I would not purchase this over another product due to the label.
It implies family farm living. Healthy. Happy animals. Peaceful, low-stress animals. I don't know anything about the company though. And I don't like the blue/yellow color scheme. I don't know why. This looks pretty, but it doesn't instill confidence. I feel like the "Perdue" label is forcefully placed on the pretty picture and doesn't work with it...like the company doesn't really embody the image or know what to do with it. This would not be my top choice based on the label.
Another "wholesome" farm
No. Purdue is offering more options today but I do not typically buy this brand.
No. It reminds me of Purdue, which does very little for agriculture and honestly seems worse than Tyson.
They've received a lot of negative publicity lately. The label suggests, home-raised, but really is just a pretty label. I would consider the other offerings in the store.
No it does not suggest anything. No I would not purchase it over another product due to the label.
No. No, there is nothing that suggests it is better or worse than another product.
No
No I don't think this label has any messages about how the company treats their animals. It would not make me more likely to buy the product over another.
No particular message is implied. I would not purchase this product simply because of the information on the label.
None whatsoever as to how nice they are to the chickens. Liked their products in the past so would pay a slight premium over unknown brand
No, no
I have enjoyed the quality of Purdue products for some time now. They are a little on the expensive side, but I do purchase their products as it fits my budget and needs, as well as provides very high quality.
May be there is homely treatment, not sure.

Indirectly, the label suggests a "homeyness" that might make someone think animals are treated better because of the "family farm" implication. However, I think most people know Perdue is a huge corporation and this label would not influence my purchase.
This is suppose to make us feel this cute country family values bull crap. All I see when I see their label is the undercover videos. I don't purchase from them.
Again, family farm that is peaceful without any sign of the feed lot of mass production
Nothing on animal treatment. Yes.
It implies that they are a small town family farm
Does not imply any message on animal treatment. Would purchase this because I know individuals who raise Perdue animals.
I don't see implications for how they treat animals. I would buy Perdue because I know the name.
Yes, I believe Perdue treats animals well. Yes, I purchase this brand all the time.
Again because of the nature scene it seems to imply that they are more aware of their treatment of their products. I may purchase this one other others.
The label doesn't imply anything about the company's thoughts on animal treatment. Design choices do not sway my opinions.
Old fashioned farm setting, implies small operation, perhaps better treatment
The product picture implies a simple laid back life where life is easy living. Perhaps we're to think the same goes for the animals. All I know is that I refuse to eat this product ever again. The meat tastes horrible and I feel fairly confident I can taste the chemicals, hormones, and whatever else they've used to treat, prep, and package the meat with. I realize that my choice never to buy this meat again is not based on the label - but now I associate my experience with the flavor of the meat with the label. This label may as well be a skull and cross bones symbol.
I don't know
I don't think the label implies anything about animal treatment, and I wouldn't decide whether to purchase the product based on the label.
no
See #37
seems kind of family friendly? i would only buy this if it were cheaper than the other type of chicken purchase i was making.
Nothing in particular
Again, this looks like a small family farm that treats all of its animals with respect.
i would because once again its a trusted brand that we have always bought
Perdue doesn't send any message about their animal treatment. I wouldn't purchase it over another label because it isn't important enough to be a factor when buying meats and other proteins for me.
They advertise their "animal welfare" but I don't believe it.
A good reputation, for the most part.
This makes me believe that the animals would have a lot of room to roam. I am not sure if I would choose this brand over another just based on this logo.
The portrait of the small town farm leads the consumer to believe that this company has small town values and probably treats the animals well. However, I don't think I would buy from this company.
Farm raised animal. Again, boils down to price.
The Purdue label uses lots of yellow - indicating purity and the golden sunset on the old farm. The hen houses behind indicate that the farmers only raise a certain number of chickens. There is lots of room around the buildings allowing for air circulation. There are no mountains, indicating that the farm is probably in the midwest. Purdue advertises on national television that they have reduced the "unnatural" things in their chicken - a step in the right direction. They also use "local" farmers but never indicate how large those farms are. Some "local" farmers can have 10,000 or more chickens in five or ten coups. Clarity in advertising is important. If given the opportunity to choose between Purdue and a store brand, I would choose Purdue. Give a choice between Purdue and organic, free range, I would choose free range. I

would prefer to buy local!
It tries to suggest "family operated" with lots of country space. Perdue, however, is notorious for how they treat "family farmers" that work for them, and, in actuality, say nothing about the nature of their chickens. I don't buy Perdue chicken.
not much because no organic, or cage free or nature words
too commercial!!!
It implies that the company uses the same, more-humane practices of a small family farm, treating their animals better than a factory.
Once again, this label gives off a friendly farm appeal. You can't really tell anything from this label. However, from their tv ads it seems they are really into treating animals right and fairly. I would choose them over other brands.
The worst of the worst!!!!!! Family farm image means zilch.
No suggestion of animal treatment
The "idyllic" farmhouse again seems to imply free range, humane treatment, etc. but there are no statements specifically mentioning this, so I wouldn't be especially compelled to purchase this brand based on the label.
This company has a good reputation and shows a happy family farm on their label. I may purchase it over other products
I am not familiar with this brand or label. It looks like a typical farmhouse that we see in the Midwest, so the label appeals to me. I might try their products due to their label.
Not about animals, but it implies "traditional farm values" - again, would not choose this product because of the labeling.
I am apathetic about this label
I have no idea what its stance on animal treatment is, but that sure is a nice picture. I would not purchase this product because I am vegetarian and don't eat meat.
Yes, it appears to be a "family" farm. No, I would not make a purchase based on the label.
I would not purchase because it says Perdue. I would look at the nutrition label and pick the one with less sodium, calories etc. People think the label is a reason to buy, not so if you ask me. Read the ingredients, it's probably all mechanically dismembered just because it's Perdue doesn't mean its humane treatment. The cutie farm house plantation type label is supposed make you feel like it's better but really is it? Read your nutrition labels. Some of the ground turkey and chicken products have more carbs, sodium etc than really lean beef. I don't buy a lot of meat so the label doesn't affect me in what I think.
No it doesn't. I know from my own research that they have the same values on my meat as I do.
Not at all Yes, if I wanted their product, I would buy it
I have no reflection on this company's view on animal treatment or well being.
No. No. It is just marketing.
Have seen their commercials in the past buy not lately about chickens
Gives a "free-range" feeling. No more likely to buy this than any other though.
Perdue depicts the same as the above pictures. You are getting your products from a small town farmer but we know that is not the case. As far as chicken goes we generally buy the organic brand only due to the fact that Tyson is the only other brand sold where I am from and I hate that chicken. Has lots of bouncy pieces and the organic brand is better trimmed. It does not necessarily pursue me to buy because it is organic.
Another happy idyllic country scene... however, I know that perdue (and tyson) have been in some serious scandals over the treatment of their hens. This label would not lull me into a false sense of chicken happiness... It is frustrating though, that a product can have "cage free" or "organic" labeling but if you look into the regulations surrounding a company being able to label their products with those terms, we are being completely taken advantage of because the regulations are so loose. Unless you see the cow/chicken/pig being raised and slaughtered, there really is no way to ensure you're getting a good, actual organic, non-chemical, free range product that isn't going to make you have to mortgage your

home to pay for dinner.
Their commercials take pride in the way they care about the animals and people. I have purchased their product and been pleased.
Nothing leads me to buy this product.
no
Not really, I don't purchase this meat based on information other consumers have provided.
Nice human home. Humans are at the top of the food chain. Animals are probably out back getting ready to be processed. No.
Again it looks good but doesn't tell us anything.
This label does not communicate anything to me about the treatment of animals. I would not choose this product over another, even if the price was the same.
no No, it means only taht it reminds you oif a farm.
a brand. If one reads about chicken and salmonella, one would give up eating chicken.
The farm on the logo is an old-style small farm, which implies that the animals could be sourced from small producers, but that's unlikely. I would not choose this product over another based solely on label.
Safe and natural.
maybe
Again, no.. Other than the fact that the label let's me know the product was produced by Perdue, the label would not influence my purchase decision.
Not specifcally animals, no. Yes, I would buy this product versus another brand, not soley due to the label, though. Again, experience with this brand comes in to play here.
Again this label shows a nice farm which can show free range. I wouldn't buy their product because this company is well known to not take care of their animals.
The Perdue label seems to suggest a confined feeding operation on a farmstead with a nice old house. I don't see any animals roaming around the fields. The animals are either in the barns or the house. Whether I would purchase a Perdue product label over another product label depends on the other label.
It implies the ideal farm life instead of the mass farm production of today. The product is consistent so the brand once again, might induce buying at the identical price point to a competitor.
The farm image seems to indicate a positive image on animal treatment, but since it's such a large company, I would assume animal treatment is not as high a priority. I would not necessarily opt for this product just because of the label.
Seems to imply small family farm where animals would be treated well. No way- not a fan of Purdue personally. I prefer chicken grown in a sustainable way.
Again, the 'homey' traditional farmhouse scene suggests certain 'old-school', traditional, natural methods / practices, (although less so than the Hillshire Farm logo scene given the long low buildings in the back which look more like the mass commercialized "chicken houses" and "hog barns" structures seen today. The fenced pasture may give the consumer the idea or hope that the cattle or dairy cows would be free-range, grass-fed, etc., so this may influence my decision over another product, however, again, not over a product that I knew to be produced in the most humane way possible.
The label suggests that wide open spaces are important to them. However, I have seen a documentary (Food Inc.) about the treatment of the farmers and of the animals. I do not buy this product because of that.
No, images on labels do not sway my opinion
Typical country home. No influence
The old fashioned farm house with the barns in the background makes me think of a small farm. Small farms care about their animals. If the price was within my range I might buy it.



Office of Research Integrity
Institutional Review Board (IRB)
2000 University Avenue
Muncie, IN 47306-0155
Phone: 765-285-5070

DATE: April 3, 2015

TO: Amy Anderson

FROM: Ball State University IRB

RE: IRB protocol # 721220-1

TITLE: The Effects of Popular Meat, Poultry and Dairy Labels on Consumers
Perceptions of the Ethical and Environmental Implications Proposed by Those Labels

SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: APPROVED

DECISION DATE: April 3, 2015

REVIEW TYPE: EXEMPT

The Institutional Review Board reviewed your protocol on April 3, 2015 and has determined the procedures you have proposed are appropriate for exemption under the federal regulations. As such, there will be no further review of your protocol, and you are cleared to proceed with the procedures outlined in your protocol. As an exempt study, there is no requirement for continuing review. Your protocol will remain on file with the IRB as a matter of record.

Exempt Categories:

	Category 1: Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
X	Category 2: Research involving the use of educational test (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior
	Category 3: Research involving the use of educational test (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under category 2, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
	Category 4: Research involving the collection of study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or

	if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.
	Category 5: Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under these programs.
	Category 6: Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed which contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Editorial Notes:

1. N/A

While your project does not require continuing review, it is the responsibility of the P.I. (and, if applicable, faculty supervisor) to inform the IRB if the procedures presented in this protocol are to be modified or if problems related to human research participants arise in connection with this project. **Any procedural modifications must be evaluated by the IRB before being implemented, as some modifications may change the review status of this project.** Please contact (ORI Staff) if you are unsure whether your proposed modification requires review or have any questions. Proposed modifications should be addressed in writing and submitted electronically to the IRB (<http://www.bsu.edu/irb>) for review. Please reference the above IRB protocol number in any communication to the IRB regarding this project.

Reminder: Even though your study is exempt from the relevant federal regulations of the Common Rule (45 CFR 46, subpart A), you and your research team are not exempt from ethical research practices and should therefore employ all protections for your participants and their data which are appropriate to your project.

Bryan Byers, PhD/Chair
Institutional Review Board

Christopher Mangelli, JD, MS, MEd, CIP/Director
Office of Research Integrity